DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 338 741 UD 028 359

AUTHOR Flugman, Bert; And Others
TITLE Training Transition Linkage Coordinators for Urban High Schools. Final Report 1988-1991. CASE No. 12-91.
INSTITUTION City Univ. of New York, N.Y. Center for Advanced Study in Education.
SPONS AGENCY Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services (ED), Washington, DC. Div. of Personnel Preparation.
PUB DATE Jun 91
CONTRACT H029G80027
NOTE 86p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC04 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Counselors; *Counselor Training; *Disabilities; Elementary School Teachers; Graduate Students; High Risk Students; *High School Graduates; High Schools; Inservice Teacher Education; Job Training; Program Evaluation; Secondary School Teachers; Special Education; Staff Development; *Transitional Programs; *Urban Schools
IDENTIFIERS *New York City Board of Education

ABSTRACT

The training program for transition linkage coordinators (TLCs) was initiated in 1988 as a staff development program for persons in the New York City (New York) schools designated to help young people with disabilities make the transition from high school to the working world or to institutions of higher learning. Those selected as TLCs come from special education, counseling, and work-study coordination. Over the 3-year period from 1988 to 1991, 78 individuals from 70 schools participated. Graduate credit was awarded for seminar participation. This report incorporates evaluation of the third project year with an overall review of the 3-year term. It is based on observations of representative seminars, post-session evaluations completed by participants, and comprehensive evaluations of the entire program by participants and program directors. The program offers a good mix of didactic and practicum experience for participants and provides them with a workable picture of the functions of a TLC. Providing graduate credits provides the opportunity for completion of outside assignments relevant to the program and the functioning of a TLC. Project staff and participants made a number of recommendations for program improvement. Appendices I and II are evaluations of the training programs of years 1 and 2. Appendix III contains two discussions of managing transition services more effectively. There are 19 tables in Appendix I. (SLD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

TRAINING TRANSITION LINKAGE COORDINATORS FOR URBAN HIGH SCHOOLS

FINAL REPORT

1988-1991

Prepared by:

Bert Flugman, Ph.D.
David Katz, Ph.D.
Mildred K. Lee, Ed.D.

Institute for Research and Development in Occupational Education
Center for Advanced Study in Education
The Graduate School and University Center
of the City University of New York

in cooperation with the
U.S. Department of Education
Handicapped Personnel Preparation Program

The program reported on herein was performed under **Grant #H029G80027**
6/1/88 - 5/31/91

June 1991
CASE #12-91

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGE
Introduction	1
Demographic Data	2
Participants Evaluations	3
Program Operation and Participant Response	11
Conclusion	18
Appendices	21

Appendix I - Evaluation of Training Program--Year I
Appendix II - Evaluation of Training Program--Year II
Appendix III - Managing Transition Services More Effectively

Transition Linkage Coordinators
Final Report, 1988-1991

Introduction

The training program for Transition Linkage Coordinators (TLCs) was initiated in 1988 as a staff development program for persons in the New York City schools exercising a new function: helping young people with disabilities make the transition from high school to the work world or to institutions of higher education. Persons selected as TLCs come from the reservoir of special education teachers, counselors and work-study coordinators. The position is in the process of being defined as TLCs try out their new roles. In some situations the TLC is relieved of one teaching period per day (two tenths of a program); in others the individual absorbs the new function as part of his or her role as a work-study coordinator or guidance counselor.

The purpose of this project has been to provide training for TLCs and to serve as a model for training in the New York City school system with a potential for replication in school districts in other parts of the country. In the course of the training effort to define the role and to clarify for TLCs the function to be performed, the project operated over a period of three years, targeting high schools in all New York City boroughs. The project presented 12 seminars each Fall for three graduate credits. In the Spring, field experiences were supervised and four additional seminars were held for two graduate credits. Over the three year period 78 individuals from 70 schools participated in this project.

The current report incorporates an evaluation of the third year of the project within an overall review of the three year term.* Statistical data include third year figures and totals for the three years. As in previous years this report stems from observation of representative seminars, from post-session evaluations submitted by participants, from a comprehensive evaluation by participants of the program as a whole, and from interviews with participants and the program directors.

*Note: contributions to this section of the final report were made by Milton J. Gold, Ed.D., the project evaluator for project periods two and three.

Information is presented on organization of the program, the motivation of participants in joining it, gains they reported in knowledge, attitudes and understanding, the effects of field experiences, networking that arose from the program, reactions to instructional leaders, and recommendations for changes in the program.

Evaluations of project periods one and two and an article describing the project in a New York State publication appear in the appendices.

Demographic Data

At the last session of the course, participants completed a demographic data form.

Over the three year period participants reported an average of 11 years experience as teachers with 9 years in special education. As an example, 21 members of the third year group responding to the survey averaged 10.65 years teaching, 9.3 in special education. The range in teaching was from 3 to 26 and in special education from 3 to 21. All but one of the group had served as classroom teachers (the exception was a counselor). In addition to teaching two thirds of them had been work-study coordinators. All but three were designated as Transition Linkage Coordinators. Thirteen served as liaison with the Office of Vocational and Educational Services for Individuals with Disabilities (VESID). One was a dean; two were grade advisors; nine cited other special education responsibilities.

The modal time devoted to TLC activity was 5 periods a week (0.2 total time) with a range from zero to 15 periods, sometimes including work-study coordination or service as department chairperson. The time allowance given for TLC activity ranged from 0 to 10 periods a week, the mode again being 5 periods. Seven of the 21 were still teaching 5 periods a day; 6 taught 4 periods; the remainder taught fewer periods. It was apparent that scant allowance was given in many cases for transition linkage.

One remarkable phenomenon in the third group was the diverse teaching background of participants. Six members had extensive experience as teachers, transition coordinators and work-study coordinators. A few had very little experience in such fields. While some of the experienced persons recommended that there be some differentation in the program based on experience, others were

pleased to develop expertise serving as mentors for the tyros. The inexperienced members enjoyed being part of the mixed group, gaining insights from their more experienced colleagues.

Participants' Evaluations

1. Post-Session Evaluation

Participants completed an evaluation form after most of the monthly sessions and also responded to a more comprehensive evaluation during the last meeting of the program.

Part I of the post-session evaluation asked participants to check reasons why they liked the day's session. Combined percentages for all sessions that were evaluated follow, indicating the most positive reactions were to receipt of new information, the knowledgeability and preparation of the presenters, and the practicality of ideas they offered:

	% Three Years
a. I received new information.	80
b. some ideas I heard before were presented in new ways.	47
c. the presenters were knowledgeable.	82
d. the presenters were well prepared.	76
e. the ideas presented were practical.	68
f. I obtained useful information about resource materials.	57
g. I learned from the group sharing interaction.	49
h. I took away some ideas and/or techniques to "try out" on the job.	41

Part II of the post-session evaluation asked participants to describe one item in the day's session that seemed of value to them. Respondents listed the following items:

General point of view

- Functions and role of the TLC
- Focus on abilities, not disabilities, of their students

School operation

- Curriculum for transition linkage
- Knowledge useful for students
- Model for work-study programs

Concept of simulating jobs

Information for transition

VESID operation

Agencies for evaluation, counseling and training

Job market profile

Placement opportunities for handicapped persons

Public sector placement

Private sector placement

Programs, including support services, in higher education

Part III of the questionnaire asked participants to complete the statement, "I would have liked this session better if. . ." Responses included:

Process suggestions

More time

More films

Video showing clients in transition linkage situations

Meeting clients who had made successful transitions

More activities, fewer lectures

Substance suggestions

Seeing transition process in action: application, interview, training

Clearer picture of criteria for admission to transition programs

List of specific entry level jobs

Contacts for jobs in work-study program

More information on blue collar jobs

Part IV asked for an over-all evaluation of each session, on a scale from 1 (poor) to 5 (outstanding). The average for all sessions was 3.73, "above aveage," with individual sessions securing ratings from 2.88 to 4.31.

2. Final Participant Evaluation

Participant evaluation included a comprehensive questionnaire distributed at the last session of the program. The questionnaire was in four parts. Part I asked participants to rate on a scale from 5 (to a large extent) to 1 (very little) skills, knowledge and attitudes related to participation in the TLC program. The ratings were all very high averaging more than 4 on a scale of 5 for all but two items.

PART I

Rating of skills, knowledge, attitudes related to your participating in the TLC program.

Averages for Three Years of Program

1. My knowledge of transition models and the elements and program components of the transition process has increased:

   To a large extent 5 4 3 2 Very little 1

   Year 1 4.06 Year 2 4.58 Year 3 3.71

2. My understanding of the vocational rehabilitation process including: goals of vocational rehabilitation, role of VESID, services provided, VESID eligibility requirements, and VESID procedures is:

   Year 1 4.35 Year 2 4.0 Year 3 4.38

3. My competencies in assisting the VESID counselor learn about the structure of my school and our special education program are:

   Year 1 4.41 Year 2 4.42 Year 3 4.43

4. My ability to provide VESID personnel with data about special education students needed for making a referral to VESID is:

   Year 1 4.71 Year 2 4.67 Year 3 4.62

5. My skill in conducting meetings with VESID personnel and school staff to review the status of students who are likely clients for VESID is:

   Year 1 4.18 Year 2 4.25 Year 3 4.28

6. I know what is needed to develop a feedback and follow-up mechanism to monitor and track students progress in the VESID referral "pipeline":

   Year 1 3.82 Year 2 3.83 Year 3 3.76

7. My awareness of programs and special services for handicapped students at local postsecondary institutions and rehabilitation agencies has increased:

Year 1 3.76 Year 2 4.42 Year 3 4.10

8. My awareness and skill of how to organize a special activity such as career fair as a means of starting a linkage process with community resources have increased:

Year 1 3.94 Year 2 4.0 Year 3 3.10

9. My knowledge of occupational programs and special programs in my school which might be appropriate for special education students is:

Year 1 4.47 Year 2 4.67 Year 3 4.28

10. My ability and knowledge of how to incorporate the outcomes of work study programs for special education into the linkage process are:

Year 1 4.24 Year 2 4.42 Year 3 4.2

11. My ability on how to organize programs aimed at informing parents about VESID, postsecondary training options and employment possibilities is:

Year 1 4.24 Year 2 4.0 Year 3 4.15

Part II of the evaluation asked participants to rank a number of items in three groups, A, B, and C, according to need and concern. These instructions were misinterpreted by many respondents who, instead, assigned A, B, and C ratings without regard to the number in each group. For purposes of tabulation, these letters have been converted to 3 (A), 2, and 1 in decreasing order of need and concern.

	Avg.			Item
	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	
1.	2.55	2.25	2.35	securing more knowledge of local rehabilitation agencies
2.	2.55	2.67	2.15	learning how to secure parental involvement
3.	2.55	2.5	2.8	having an assistant principal who is supportive of the transition process
4.	2.55	2.67	2.65	having specific time allotment for TLC activities
5.	2.22	1.5	1.65	getting colleagues to serve on the transition team
6.	1.92	1.67	1.75	being more skillful in conducting an exit interveiw
7.	2.55	2.75	2.55	developing a working relationship with VESID
8.	2.12	2.08	2.5	developing a working relationship with employers in the community
9.	2.22	1.42	1.75	learning about labor market conditions in the community
10.	2.55	2.25	2.2	being able to secure additional vocational training opportunities in the school for special education students
11.	1.92	2.0	2.0	identifying postsecondary training opportunities at local community colleges
12.	1.92	2.08	2.25	obtaining usable assessment data.
13.	*	1.33	1.9	planning special events (e.g. Career Day, trips to business and industry.
14.	*	1.83	2.45	maintaining transition files and records (e.g. logs, diaries).
15	*	1.83	1.85	infusing career information into the regular subject matter curriculum.

*Questions not included on first year survey.

It may be seen, therefore, that participants expressed greatest concern over developing a working relationship with VESID, learning how to secure parental involvement, having a specific time allocation for TLC activity, having a supportive assistant principal, securing more vocational opportunities for their students, and securing more knowledge of local rehabilitation agencies.

Part III attempts to secure data on the effect of the program. For each item, an average "before" and "now" is given. Ratings of the person with only two years experience have been omitted. Ratings of the other 11 respondents have been totalled in the "before" and "now" columns, and a third column gives the ratio between the "before" and "now" ratings. Finally, a "before"-"now" rating is given for each of these eleven participants.

	BEFORE			NOW					
	AVERAGES FOR EACH YEAR						RATIO NOW/BEFORE		
	Never 1 2		A lot 3 4	Never 1 2		A lot 3 4			
1. determining transition services needed by students	Y1	Y2	Y3	Y1	Y2	Y3	Y1	Y2	Y3
	2.7	2.0	2.3	3.7	3.5	3.6	1.37	1.75	1.57
2. developing a transitional plan (formal and informal) for students)	Y1	Y2	Y3	Y1	Y2	Y3	Y1	Y2	Y3
	2.0	1.75	2.0	3.3	3.7	3.5	1.63	2.10	1.75
3. conferring with colleagues who run work-study programs	Y1	Y2	Y3	Y1	Y2	Y3	Y1	Y2	Y3
	2.68	2.0	2.7	3.6	2.8	3.7	1.33	1.42	1.37
4. conferring with guidance personnel on referral needs to ensure appropriate services will be provided	Y1	Y2	Y3	Y1	Y2	Y3	Y1	Y2	Y3
	2.9	2.3	2.9	3.5	3.6	3.6	1.21	1.54	1.24
5. conducting exit interviews	Y1	Y2	Y3	Y1	Y2	Y3	Y1	Y2	Y3
	1.7	1.6	1.9	2.8	3.2	3.3	1.69	2.0	1.74
6. identifying community agencies who provide services to special education students after they leave school	Y1	Y2	Y3	Y1	Y2	Y3	Y1	Y2	Y3
	2.4	2.3	2.1	3.4	3.6	3.5	1.41	1.59	1.67
7. organizing a transition planning team and conducting meetings	Y1	Y2	Y3	Y1	Y2	Y3	Y1	Y2	Y3
	1.5	1.4	1.4	2.8	3.2	2.2	1.84	2.24	1.57
8. conferring with parents regarding transition plans	Y1	Y2	Y3	Y1	Y2	Y3	Y1	Y2	Y3
	2.4	1.9	2.3	3.0	3.2	3.3	1.25	1.65	1.43
9. conferring with vocational education and career education staff	Y1	Y2	Y3	Y1	Y2	Y3	Y1	Y2	Y3
	2.6	1.8	2.2	3.3	2.8	3.4	1.26	1.55	1.55
10. assuming liaison responsibility with a VESID counselor or conferring with a colleague who is the VESID liaison	Y1	Y2	Y3	Y1	Y2	Y3	Y1	Y2	Y3
	2.1	1.8	2.4	3.3	3.5	3.5	1.58	1.91	1.46
11. having special education students participate in a schoolwide or departmental career day	Y1	Y2	Y3	Y1	Y2	Y3	Y1	Y2	Y3
	1.9	1.6	2.1	2.9	2.8	2.6	1.55	1.79	1.24
12. learning about transitional employment and supported employment	Y1	Y2	Y3	Y1	Y2	Y3	Y1	Y2	Y3
	2.1	1.9	2.4	3.6	3.4	3.7	1.73	1.78	1.54
13. identifying local businesses who are potential employers	Y1	Y2	Y3	Y1	Y2	Y3	Y1	Y2	Y3
	1.8	1.8	2.0	2.7	3.0	2.9	1.55	1.71	1.45

	BEFORE			NOW					
	AVERAGES FOR EACH YEAR						RATIO NOW/BEFORE		
	Never 1 2		A lot 3 4	Never 1 2		A lot 3 4			
14. targeting names of students for transition planning and coordinating data management	Y1 2.0	Y2 2.1	Y3 2.3	Y1 3.4	Y2 3.5	Y3 3.5	Y1 1.66	Y2 1.68	Y3 1.52
15. identifying mainstream opportunities e.g.: special projects, programs, or vocational classes that would benefit special education students	Y1 2.5	Y2 2.5	Y3 2.6	Y1 3.1	Y2 3.4	Y3 3.2	Y1 1.26	Y2 1.37	Y3 1.23
16. conferring with coordinators of handicapped services at local community or four year colleges	Y1 1.9	Y2 1.4	Y3 2.1	Y1 2.7	Y2 2.8	Y3 3.0	Y1 1.44	Y2 1.94	Y3 1.43
17. seeing that special education students participate in school-wide career day activities.	Y1 1.8	Y2 1.5	Y3 2.0	Y1 2.7	Y2 2.8	Y3 2.7	Y1 1.48	Y2 1.89	Y3 1.35
Total, 17 items (mean overall change)	Y1 2.18	Y2 1.86	Y3 2.20	Y1 3.17	Y2 3.23	Y3 3.27	Y1 1.45	Y2 1.73	Y3 1.39
Three Year Total									1.50

A ratio of 1.0 indicates no change from "before" to "now". Higher ratios predominate, indicating moderate to extensive effect of the program. In the three years of the program, the mean overall change was 1.45, 1.73 and 1.39. The lower ratio in the third year resulted from greater diversity among participants that year. Four participants with an average of 14.5 years experience, including long assignment as work-study coordinators, showed no change. The remaining group with 9.6 years of experience, some of them new to this type of counseling, averaged a ratio of 1.86. This corresponds for all three years to an increase in 1½ steps in the scale of 4, a marked increase in transition activities.

Part IV of the evaluation asked participants to describe a "successful" transition story of one student with whom they had worked as a TLC. Practically all of the respondents provided such an account. The cases they cited included students who were learning disabled, emotionally disturbed, or physically handicapped. Learning disabled cases generally included arrangements for evaluation, counseling, and cooperative planning with VESID, leading to developing a career or educational "road map." Students were enrolled in work-study programs or placed in part-time employment in some cases. These led to part or full time paid employment and to increased self-confidence on the part of students. They were helped to form realistic views of future careers or schooling, to explore various vocational training or higher educational opportunities, to find jobs or to gain admission to, and financial aid in, colleges. Counseling and new information caused some students to improve their learning skills, raise their grades and gain acceptance to colleges. Two emotionally disturbed students were helped to modify their behavior, and through job placement adjust to their problems and their environment. Consultation with an overprotective parent produced permission for a student to accept an off-site work-study placement. This "shy, frightened" girl developed self-confidence in the process. In some cases, contact was maintained after students left school. The anecdotes helped to document success of their assignment as TLCs.

Program Operation and Participant Response

1. Who participated in the program?

All of the participants held some instructional or supervisory function within Special Education Departments in New York City High Schools. Practically all carried partial teaching loads. They also had part-time assignments as grade advisors, special education coordinators, or they had new assignments as transition linkage coordinators. Six to twelve participants were interviewed each year. Participants had an average of 11 years teaching experience, most or all of it in special education. Their assignments were, for the most part, with learning disabled or emotionally handicapped students.

The majority of participants were special education personnel working in individual schools. The target population initally had been one special educator from each high school in the selected boroughs. A number of supervisors from borough

superintendents' offices also took part to begin with, but they dropped out during or after the first semester. Persistence in the program of school-based individuals was relatively good, taking into consideration inevitable withdrawals for reasons of personal exigency.

2. Why did they enroll in the program?

In general, participants enrolled in the program because of concern for the future of students with handicapping conditions when they would be leaving or graduating from high school. One described the transition process as "probably the most critical area." Others wanted to develop greater facility in working with parents and learning how to involve them. Participants were interested in enhancing their competence in career education. Other reasons were also given. Some participants were attracted by the five graduate credits they would earn. Others had no need for additional credits. A few were interested in preparing for supervisory licenses, and one of these was working on a doctorate in administration and supervision. One person said he knew that the position of TLC would be established formally, and he felt the learnings would be valuable to students in the next few years.

3. Pertinent aspects of the organization of the program.

The project leaders took various steps to promote establishment of a TLC position as a regular part of special education on the high school level. These steps included careful observance of protocol in involving high school special education administrators at the central office of the Board of Education as well as executive assistants to superintendents on the borough level. The program was described in the monthly meetings of assistant principals in charge of special education in the high schools, and they were asked to submit the names of persons who should be invited to participate. Project staff, in a memorandum sent to high school assistants-to-principal of special education, indicated that primary criteria for participant selection were to include (1) experience in working with the office of Vocational and Educational Services for Individuals with Disabilities (VESID), in transition programs and/or in conducting career education, work-study, or occupational training programs, and (2) the recommendation by a special education

assistant-to-principal or supervisor. Attending the initial training session were the executive assistant for high school special education from both the central and borough offices, a representative from VESID, and the coordinator of transition training at the central office. These persons constitute an advisory committee which met two or three times a year to discuss such matters as selection criteria, progress of the program, feedback from current and former participants, and efforts to institutionalize transition programs and the training of TLCs.

4. Didactic elements of the training

4.1 Role perception. The TLC position is a new assignment in New York City high schools. In the first year individuals reported they had little knowledge of the TLC's role to begin with, but, in the course of the program they developed an understanding of what students need in making a transition to postsecondary education or to the work world. By the third year of the project, individuals were better acquainted with the position since several of them had already been providing transition services as work-study coordinators. This understanding led to realization of the potential of the TLC position in helping students in this process. Directors distributed and led discussion of a manual on transition published in Georgia.

4.2 The process of transition. Participants were given help in "making the transition easy" for students and in working out transition plans with them. They learned that transition is an individual matter for each student. The seminars helped to "concretize" the process and the resources available.

4.3 Understanding. To begin with, participants reported new awareness of the need of students for help in making the transition, of their need to avoid "graduating with no place to go." They said they learned that students need to know that they do have opportunities for work or further education, that the diploma is not the be all and end all, and that one has to get ready for the world one will live in and work in. Broader understandings were also reported--that many things are in transition, not just college or work. As one participant said, "It helped me see things I hadn't been aware of."

4.4 Information on resources. An important outcome was learning of resources for the handicapped, both in vocations and in post secondary education. First, participants "gained a wider scope of where I should look." They discovered

programs for students who would not get a diploma and alternative programs for students not succeeding in school. They learned of resources in the field like VESID, and the International Center for the Disabled (ICD), and other agencies to link students when leaving school. Participants said they can now give students career options, having new information to help students gain employment. For students succeeding in school, they learned of programs in trade schools and in colleges which provide "bridge programs" for learning disabled students.

4.5 Information about the labor market.

Participants welcomed information they received on labor market trends and local market analysis. They cited three sources: outside speakers, the program directors, and materials reprinted from a number of journals. One person complained that there was so much material she couldn't read it all. The directors regarded this comment as a misinterpretation: the materials were intended as the beginning of a resource file each participant could assemble, not necessarily as overnight reading matter.

4.6 Attitudes of business toward employment of the handicapped. Presentations by representatives of the private and public sectors (e.g., IBM and the Port Authority, respectively) reassured participants on employment possibilities for their students. Companies, they heard, are willing to make allowances for handicaps. Jobs are available where persons like their students can work to the satisfaction of their employers. Large organizations are readier than small companies to accept such employees. Participants spoke of continuing contact with former students and their supervisors for a year or two after leaving. One suggested the value of a workshop for employers on hiring and supervising the handicapped.

4.7 Postsecondary opportunities. Speakers from community and senior colleges described programs that are being offered to students with academic deficiencies. In addition, a representative of VESID indicated services his organization could provide in making the transition to college, and participants reported working as a team with a VESID member to plan college preparatory strategies for students. They discovered that admission is not only possible, but that some institutions offer "bridge" programs which provide remedial and developmental work for students needing it. Employment services are also offered to students who enroll. This information came as a suprise to many participants who had not been aware of growing flexibility on the part of colleges.

4.8 Outside speakers. Participants gave high marks to the speakers who made presentations. They felt that speakers were realistic in assessing employment possibilities for school leavers and postsecondary opportunities for students who would continue their education. As regards process, the project directors were more critical, recognizing that some speakers tended to exceed the time allotted to them; some dwelt too long on the structure of their organization, and some were less than dynamic. They indicated a possible move in the future to a format making use of panels at times instead of speakers appearing in series.

4.9 Programming students in high school to prepare for careers. Participants looked at the TLC's role in programming special education students. This involved helping new students when they enter the school, finding the aptitudes that students have, not only intellectual but also manual as well. Programming was viewed not as a one-shot deal, but as organizing a vocational or academic sequence. Selecting students for work-study programs was also discussed even though such cooperative programs might be the responsibility of another special education coordinator.

4.10 The TLC's role as a counselor. Participants spoke of forming a bond with students, of having them know "that you're there at all times," still there to help them after they leave school. The TLC's role is to help students relate to school, to the subjects they take, and to jobs they find or aspire to. They acknowledged help of program directors to them as counselors: "They confirmed and validated what I'm doing, broke down a sense of isolation."

4.11 Working with parents. Responding to advice to involve parents in the transition process, they cited the financial problems of parents who might lose a day's pay in order to see the TLC. They appreciated learning what other coordinators were doing who succeeded in setting up interviews with parents.

5. Field experiences, practicum and assignments in the training program

The TLC training program reached out from the seminar to field trips, visits to participants in their school, and assignments oriented to transition linkage. Visits were made to the International Center for the Disabled which does vocational evaluation of handicapped persons and provides vocational training on site.

The practicum took the form of consultation by the project director with participants at their school site. Participants planned projects which the directors

reviewed with them. These projects were unique to particular schools and included such items as producing a videotape, holding a career day for special education students, and developing a collaborative curriculum with the business community. Directors observed lessons on transition given by participants who conducted general and exit interviews, and case conferences. In the main, the directors engaged in problem solving with participants, helping them to overcome hurdles as they went about setting up a transition linkage program. Participants expressed a desire to increase the number of consultant visits.

Four assignments were completed by participants:

- Developing a profile of the school, identifying the resources and services available. Students reported surprise at the existence of resources of which they were not aware.
- Preparing a critique of a Georgia monograph on transition linkage which provides a picture of the process.
- Developing a case load of eight students and a plan of operation for their transition from high school.
- Preparing a plan for a practicum activity.

6. Networking

Participants referred to networking taking place both during the seminars and outside them between sessions. They spoke of telephone conversations, using each other's resources, building a sense of trust, and sharing among members of the group. Setting up a course of study profited from discussion with other persons. One participant noted that this networking had "broken down my sense of isolation. What others do serves as validation for my operation." Several individuals said that exposure to other TLCs was what they liked best in the program.

7. Participants' evaluation of program and instructors

All participants interviewed expressed enthusiasm for the program and its organization. They liked the combination of general sessions featuring speakers with smaller group sessions where they had more opportunity to participate and especially to exchange ideas with their colleagues. They approved the "bull session" taking place as the final portion of most meetings where they could throw a variety

of problems into the hopper. They were happy to see what others were doing and appreciated participation from "graduates" of the previous year's program.

Adjectives they used to describe their instructors (the project directors) were "realistic," "knowledgeable," "sharing expertise," "incisive," "aware of what is going on," and "expert in understanding and enhancing dynamics among people." They commented on "the instructors' skill in informing us, in setting up problems, and forcing us to work out solutions in the activities they presented. . .forcing us to think and to rely on our own creativity."

8. Handbook

A handbook on transition linkage has been produced. Several participants were relieved of other assignments in order to prepare a draft which has been reviewed by others in the group. Those participating in this publication saw it as a "jumping-off point for a dynamic process that we will take in the fall to help others. It gives us some credibility to do that."

9. Changes recommended by participants and project directors.

Participants suggested various changes in the program, some representing only one person's opinion:

- More contact sessions--touch base more frequently
- Visit companies employing the handicapped to see them in action on the job and to interview them concerning job opportunities and work attitudes
- Develop two tracks in the training program to target those with more and those with less experience and sophistication
- More practical suggestions on how the TLC job can be done
- Definition of what TLC should do in one's school
- More structured, less process-oriented program with greater emphasis on didactic segment.

Project directors were hoping that the school board would allow more time to TLCs to devote to the transition process. With respect to the training program they made these suggestions:

- Take greater care in selecting participants, including persons with more experience, and those in a situation where a practicum project is possible,

- Plan to include more field trips
- Identify speakers who are dynamic and will adhere to time limit; utilize panel rather than solo speakers so that they can dialogue with each other on the relevance of services offered and possibilities of collaborating with each other
- Bring central office coordinator into more sessions
- Continuously reconsider what we do.

Conclusion

The Transition Linkage Coordinator training program offered a good mix of didactic and practicum experiences for participants. A full menu of information was offered concerning problems and opportunities that students with handicaps experience upon leaving high school, either for the work world or for postsecondary education. The expertise of the project directors was supplemented by a number of speakers representing the private and public sectors, agencies for the handicapped, trade schools, and community and senior colleges. Complementing presentations by speakers was a wealth of printed material.

The program provided participants with a workable picture of the functions of a TLC. Field experience added realism to the didactic sessions, but even more impressive was the assistance given by the project directors to participants through visits to their schools, observation of their procedures in the schools, and problem solving with them.

Providing possibility of graduate course credit carried with it the opportunity to call for completion of outside assignments. These assignments were relevant to the functioning of a TLC and related both to the seminars and to the visits made by the directors to participants.

Participants were highly positive in their evaluation of the program as a whole as well as in their assessment of individual sessions. It was apparent that they were growing in personal security as well as knowledgeability as pertains to their TLC assignment. In addition, they were forming their own network for communication and mutual self-help in the future.

The training program for Transition Linkage Coordinators succeeded in orienting participants to the role and functions of a new position in special

education. In a period of three years, the program reached 78 coordinators in all of New York City's five boroughs. Practically all of the persons completing the program were well experienced special educators, functioning both as classroom teachers and as guidance personnel or coordinators of special programs. Most were already designated as TLCs, but all needed to define their role in transition linkage, to develop interpersonal and group skills, to secure information on processes to be employed, to identify resources available for training, and to amass information on the job market and employability of young people with disabilities.

Participants benefitted from monthly didactic sessions and on-site visits from consultants who reviewed with them their special projects as well as their performance as TLCs. Evaluation of the seminars was positive. On a scale from 1 (poor) to 5 (outstanding), the average rating of individual sessions ranged from 2.88 to 4.31, with an average of 3.73 (above average) for the whole series. Asked to rate specific items, participants checked most frequently new information, knowledgeability and preparation of presenters, and practicality of the ideas presented.

In a final evaluation, participants rated skills, knowledge and attitudes related to their training activities, assigning average scores from 3.10 to 4.71 on a scale from 1 to 5. Appropriateness to their students, knowledge of transition models, ability to work with VESID personnel, and awareness of program and services for handicapped students received top ranking. Among needs and concerns in carrying out their role as TLC, participants listed as most important developing a working relationship with VESID, learning how to secure parent involvement, having a specific time allotment for TLC activities, and having a supportive assistant principal.

Of special interest were the participants' response to questions asking them to rate their own transition linkage activities before their entry into the training program as compared with their current activity. Seventeen activities were listed, and participants were asked to report their involvement in these activities from 1 (never) to 4 (a lot). Ratings for the 17 behaviors over the three-year peiod yielded an average ratio of 1.5. This may be interpreted to mean that participants increased their activities by 50 percent in the course of the training program. The ratios for individual TLCs ranged from 1.0 (no increase in activity, a phenomenon

related to a few persons who entered the program with many years of related experience) to 3.88 (almost four times as much).

Finally, participants were asked to describe one case where they felt they had helped a student make a successful transition. This anecdotal evidence indicated both the potential of transition linkage activity and the feeling of accomplishment that such activity brought to the TLCs. Participants were proud of their increased ability to help student adjust their career expectations to reality, adapt to work-study experiences, enter into training programs, find job placements, improve learning skills, gain admission to colleges and develop greater self-confidence.

Project staff and participants made a number of suggestions for improvement in the program detailed on page 17 of this report. The most viable suggestions appear to be those that would make the TLC function a more tangible one through greater personal contact with clients, agencies, potential employers and postsecondary institutions and through greater use of audio-visual media.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX I

Transition Linkage Coordinators
Evaluation of Training Program
Year I

TRANSITION LINKAGE COORDINATORS

Evaluation of Training Program

Year I

Rochelle G. Kaplan, Ph.D.

July 1989

TRANSITION LINKAGE COORDINATORS

Evaluation of Training Program: Year I

The effectiveness of the Transition Linkage Coordinators (TLC) program was formally assessed in two ways. First, after each training session, participants completed a Session Evaluation Form. This form consisted of three sections including an overall rating of the meeting, a section for identifying positive aspects of the session, and a section for enumerating the shortcomings of the session. The goal of this part of the evaluation process was to gather information for the purpose of refining and improving the training sessions based on participant feedback.

The second type of evaluation was summative and focused primarily on the impact of the program on participants' professional practices. It consisted of participants' responses to four-part questionnaire completed at the end of training. Its components included a self-assessment of skill attainment related to training in the program, ratings of areas of need for further training, a comparison of involvement in TLC activities before and after training, and a detailed report of the processes used in a successfully resolved transition case carried out by each participant.

Session Evaluations Forms

Evaluations forms were completed at the end of Sessions 2, 3 4, 5, 6, 7, 9, and 10. No forms were completed for Session 1 because..... Also forms were not completed for Session 8 because..... Each of the three questions on the form will be discussed separately and compared across sessions.

1. Overall Rating of Sessions

Overall ratings of the success of each session were obtained on a scale of 1 (poor) to 5 (outstanding), with 3 indicating average, 2 below average and 4 above average. Table 1 lists the mean ratings of participants at each session.

Table 1

Mean Overall Participant Ratings of Each Training Session

Session #	Number of Respondents	Mean Overall Rating
2	27	4.1
3	26	3.5
4	24	3.6
5	26	4.3
6	22	3.9
7	27	3.6
9	27	3.9
10	22	3.6
All Sessions Combined		3.8

As the table indicates, on the average, respondents rated all sessions as slightly above to above average in quality. In total for

all the sessions there were only two ratings of below average, while there were 37 ratings of excellent (see Table 2).

Table 2

Summary of Frequencies of Overall Session Ratings

Rating	Session								
	2	3	4	5	6	7	9	10	Total
1 (poor)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2 (below average)	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	2
3 (average)	5	12	8	5	6	13	9	12	64
4 (above average)	15	10	14	8	12	12	13	8	92
5 (outstanding)	7	3	1	13	4	2	5	2	37

While all sessions were well received, Session 5 on.....was given the higest ratings by participants.

2. Aspects of Sessions that Were Liked

An examination of responses to the questions relating to the positive and negative aspects of the sessions reveals some of the underlying reasons for the above ratings. Respondents were given 11 specified options and an open-ended "other" category on which to indicate the reasons that they liked any particular session. They could chose as many or as few of the items as they felt applied. The options are listed below:

a. I received new information.
b. Some ideas I heard before were presented in new ways
c. The presenters were knowledgeable.
d. The presenters were well prepared.

 BEST COPY AVAILABLE

e. The instructors were effective group leaders.
f. The ideas presented were practical.
g. The presentation gave me something about which to think.
h. I obtained useful information about resource materials.
i. I enjoyed the experiential aspects of the lesson.
j. I learned from the group sharing and interaction.
k. I took away some ideas and/or techniques to "try out" on the job.
l. Other (specify)

Each of the categories represents some goal or aspect of the training process. The percentage of respondents who selected each of the categories was calculated for each session. Table 3 shows the percentage of responses made in each category session by session and summarizes the percentage of responsee in each category across all sessions.

Table 3

Percent of Participants Selecting Categories of Reasons for Liking Each Session

	Sessions								
Item	2	3	4	5	6	7	9	10	Mean
a. received new information	70	100*	79	100*	77	63	70	86*	81
b. ideas presented in new ways	56	46	67	54	36	52	59	28	46
c. presenters were knowledgeable	89*	96*	96*	96*	73	44	89*	95*	85
d. presenters were well prepared	93*	92*	83*	88*	73	48	85*	82	81
e. effective group leaders	63	62	54	77	45	52	63	45	58
f. ideas presented were practical	74	69	71	81	91*	59	74	50	71
g. presentations provoked thought	78	73	75	96*	73	70*	63	64	74
h. info on resource materials	67	73	67	81	77	41	44	50	63
i. experiential aspects	67	69	25	50	41	33	41	5	41
j. group sharing and interaction	41	69	54	31	73	74*	41	28	51
k. ideas to try on the job	70	62	37	38	64	37	37	28	47

* Most frequently selected in a particular session

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Table 3 shows that the proportion of responses to each of the categories varied from session to session, although some categories were generally selected more often than others. The mean values of the table indicate that receiving new information, knowledgeability of the presenters, and how well prepared the presenters contributed most to the particpants' liking of the sessions in general. In contrast, familiar ideas presented in new ways, the experiential aspects of the program, and taking away techniques to use on the job were the categories that were selected least frequently for the sessions on the whole.

Examining the data session by session, however, indicates that all individual sessions did not necessarily follow the same pattern and that the choice of options, undoubtedly was affected by the content and format of particular sessions. For example, at Session 5 most participants found that the session gave them something to think about and that this was an important factor in making the session well liked. In Session 6 participants liked the program because the ideas presented were practical. Session 7, however, had the lowest ratings of what was liked in all categories compared to the other sessions. Nevertheless, particiants who did rate the categories in ths session were more inclinedto like the session becase the presentations gave them something to think about and because they learned from the group interaction and sharing.

In summary these results suggest that the most powerful aspects of the program for the greatest number of partipants throughout all sessions was the knowledge and information of the presenters. Also in

 BEST COPY AVAILABLE

General most of the respondents did not seem to feel that the sessions were particularly strong in giving them ideas and techniques to try out on the job. The fact, though,. that even some of the participants checked off this category indicates that this component was present, even if not the most salient aspect of the program. Finally these results also seem to indicate that while there was some appreciation of the experiential and group sharing aspects of the program, these seem to be most salient only in the seventh session which dealt with.....

3. What_Would_Have_Made_the_Session_Better

Five categories were suggested here for open-ended responses. These consisted of:

a. if more time had been spent on....

b. if there had been more opportunities to.....

c. if the presenters had been more...

d. if additional information had been included about...

e. other....

Table 4 indicates the percent of respondents who completed this section of the form at each session.

Table 4

Percent of Respondents Answering Question About How Session Could Have Been Better

Session	Percent Responding
2	59
3	88
4	83
5	65
6	64
7	52
9	44
10	41

As indicated in the table, the number of respondents answeri
tion tended to decrease over time. This is perhaps best e:
the participants' increasing familiarity with the program
d its content. In part their needs may have been met and s
less to ask about. Also in part they may have realized
their comments from week to week might be the same and so
ating. Nevertheless, the comments that were made are o·
are reported below in Tables 5 to 8 in terms of the fre
urrence of particular categories of responses at each s

Table 5

Frequency of Occurrence of Categories Referring to How Sessions Could be Improved If More Time Had Been Allotted

Comment Type	Frequency of Occurrence By Session								
	2	3	4	5	6	7	9	10	Sum
First part of session (presenters)	0	1	0	5	0	0	4	2	12
Second part of session (group activity)	1	4	0	1	0	3	1	1	10
Confining session to just one part	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Video portion of session (case study)	0	2	0	0	0	1	1	0	4
Discussions or questions	0	1	5	1	2	5	2	0	16
Info re: vocational assessment	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	3
Issues re: adjusting to work	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Eligibility criteria	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	2
Job placement	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Training techniques	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Info re: community college opportunities	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
Info re: school-based programs	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	3
Developmentally disabled	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1
Practice testing	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1

In general, participants were about evenly divided across all sessions in wanting more time spent on both the first and the second parts of the program. In particular, they seemed to be concerned with having more discussion time and getting more information during each session. Only the content of the type of information desired seemed to vary across sessions.

Table 6

Frequency of Occurrence of Categories Referring to How Sessions Could be Improved If There Had Been More Opportunites

Comment Type	Freqeuncy of Occurrence By Session								
	2	3	4	5	6	7	9	10	Sum
Small group interaction and sharing experiences	4	2	2	4	4	2	1	0	19
Hands on materials	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Discussion/questioning presenters	1	5	9	2	2	2	3	0	24
Discuss case studies (video)	0	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
Follow ICD and OVR referral process and discuss it	0	3	2	0	0	0	0	0	5
Specific skills and and assessment techniques	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	2
Info from other community colleges	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
In-depth consideration of programs	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	2
Discuss how to prepare for employment	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	2
Model programs	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1

For the most part these results indicate that respondents wanted more opportunity to have small group interactions and sharing of experiences among participants. They also wanted to have more opportunity to ask presenters questions.

Table 7

Frequency of Occurrence of Categories Referring to How Presenters Could Have Improved the Sessions

Comment Type	Frequency of Occurrence By Session								
	2	3	4	5	6	7	9	10	Sum
Handouts should be given out before presentations	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Presenters needed no improvement	3	1	3	0	0	1	1	1	10
Could be more effective as speaker	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Be more specific -use examples - evaluation tools -where to contact agencies -how OVR process works- -about special ed students	1	2	1	2	0	0	1	3	10
Info re: role of linkage coordinator	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Less hurried, spoke too fast, more time	0	4	0	0	1	0	0	0	5
Lacked need equipment	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Fewer acronyms for organizations	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
More open to answering questions	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	

Apart from some specific complaints about individual speakers, the participants were generally satisfied with the presenters. However, the most common dissatisfaction was that the presenters did not always provide specific information that could be applied by TLC workers.

Table 8

Frequency of Occurrence of Categories Referring to How the Sessions Could Have Improved by Additional Information

Comment Type	Frequency of Occurrence By Session								
	2	3	4	5	6	7	9	10	Sum
Interest, aptitude and other tests for special ed	7	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	9
How to interpret records as a TLC	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	2
Meaning of initials used	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Overhead projector material	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Whom to contact	0	1	3	0	3	0	0	0	7
Other programs besides OVR (rehab, colleges, board of ed)	0	2	0	6	1	0	0	0	9
Interpreting case histories	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	2
How clients are placed after rehab process	0	1	2	0	0	0	1	1	5
Referral procedures	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
School assignments	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1
Model programs for L.D. students	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	2
Training program at specific agencies	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1
What to do with students who are not job ready	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1
Whom does agency serve	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1

The kinds of information that participants wanted to know more about after each session tended to be quite varied. The most commonly requested areas included finding out whom to contact in various agencies, identifying more sources for referral of students, and looking beyond the rehabilitation process to what their students would

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

do after training. In addition, there seemed to be some initial concern about finding out more about assessment instruments.

Finally, in the last section of this question, respondents were asked to list any other ideas they had about what would have made the session better. Below are some of the most representative comments made.

Session 2

Overall insight into the clinical component of assessment was excellent.

I would be interested in finding out more about practical work situations for low functioning students.

I would like to know about the topics being covered in Occupational Education classes.

I would have liked the speaker to give out more new information.

Session 3

The materials presented this week were very pertinent and not like last week's presenter who simply restated what was on the handouts.

The fact that others interrupted to explain or summarize was disturbing.

The first presenter spoke too rapidly, gave too much information, used too many initials without explaining them.

I felt that there was too much information at once.

Session 4

I learned more positive things about the OVR process than I had previously thought existed.

In general, not just for this session, I would like more specifics about the actual TLC position.

I would like to be taken through the evaluation process with OVR.

The presenter was well informed and had a well structured format.

This session was very informative and cleared up a lot of confusion on my part.

I learned the most from teachers describing their experiences and procedures for helping students with placemets and referrals.

I would have liked more group time to discuss our hopes, fears, and ideas for the TLC position.

Session_5

I would prefer less time spent on programs for the deaf and more time given to other disabilities.

This was an unusual presentation for me because of the deaf speakers. They were very informative and created an awareness of prospects for high school students who are hearing impaired.

I would like to learn more about college participation in special education programs.

Are there any similar programs in the other boroughs?

Very inspiring session for teachers of special education.

The speaker was informative and enjoyable, but the length of time that he took was in contrast to the small number of deaf students we each have to plan for in our schools.

This presentation concentrated too much on one specific disability that not all of us can relate to.

Session_6

We are getting so much reading material that it has become almost impossible to review a good portion of it.

The information was concrete.

Instead of hearing about different transitional sites, I would like to see them.

Session_7

I would like you to explain exactly our role in this process.

Although we are given interesting and pertinent information, I feel I need help with planning the ITP and that I have gotten none in any session to date. The transition process is far larger than I can manage from my position as a teacher.

This session was interesting, but I would have preferred help with developing an ITP since the whole concept is totally overwhelming.

Session_7

Why can t my work study students receive a stipend next term?

Why so much emphasis on students who graduate from high school and obtain jobs? Why not have sessions that emphasize how to get a student job ready in the schools?

I would like more info on readiness skills for specific jobs.

I ve heard about many programs and I feel very frustrated that my school is not involved in any of them?

Session_10

These speakers were clearer and more interesting than the previous speakers.

I would like more about how to address problems at our own schools and fewer generalities.

As can be seen from the content of the above comments, very few participants actually focused on how to make the sessions better. Rather they tended to use the open-ended questions as a forum for expressing general concerns about their roles as TLCs and about their overall feelings toward the program. Many of the comments were positive rather than critical and probably reflected a generally good feeling toward the program. On the other hand, some of the participants seemed to be disturbed by a certain experienced vagueness in the program and felt that they needed more specific instructions about taking care of the details of the TLC position.

End_of_Training_Assessment_of_Program_Impact

The four sections of this questionnaire will be discussed separately below. All data were examined for the group as a whole (N = 26). In addition, participants were divided into three types, those who listed their job title as TLC (TLC Only, N = 8), those who identified

themselves as part-time TLCs but also indicated their main occupation (PT/TLC, N = 9), and those who did not identify themselves as TLCs at all (Non-TLC, N = 9). The primary difference between the PT/TLC and the Non-TLC groups might have been that the former group was given some release time to perform TLC funcions, but that the latter group was not. The difference between the TLC Only and PT/TLC groups was probably that the latter had less time for TLC functions, but tha in fact these participants saw the TLC position as an intregral part of their job. Perhaps those who listed themselves as TLC Only could not see the TLC function as part of their regular work, but only as something apart from it. To the extent that these participants felt this way, they may have felt somewhat overburdened by the transitional linkage coordinator tasks.

1. Rating of Skills, Knowledge, Attitudes Related to Participation in TLC Program

Participants were asked to rate themselves on 11 items about their skills, knowledge, and attitudes related to the TLC program. The ratings ranged from 1 to 5 with 5 indicating excellent and 1 indicating very low. Items 1, 7, and 8 specifically referred to perceived increases in skill or knowledge as a function of training. All other items referred to compentencies required to handle the TLC position, such as knowledge of OVR procedures, skill in conducting meetings with OVR personnel and school staff, and ability to organize programs aimed at giving parents information about postsecondary training options.

Table 9 indicates the mean ratings by item for all participants.

Table 9

Mean Ratings of Skills, Knowledge and Attitudes for all Participants After Training

Item	Mean Rating
1. Knowledge of transition models	4.15 (very good)
2. Understanding of goals of vocational rehabilitation process	4.23 (very good)
3. Competencies in assisting OVR counselor in my school	4.17 (very good)
4. Ability to provide OVR with relevant referral data	4.50 (almost excellent)
5. Skill in conducting meetings with OVR personnel and school staff	4.08 (very good)
6. Knowledge of what is needed to follow up OVR referral	3.89 (pretty good)
7. Awareness of local postsecondary programs for handicapped students	4.11 (very good)
8. Awareness of and skill in organizing special activity such as career fair	3.89 (pretty good)
9. Knowledge of occupational programs in my school for special education	4.00 (very good)
10. Ability to incorporate works study into linkage process	4.22 (very good)
11. Ability to organize informational programs for parents	3.89 (pretty good)

These results indicate that, overall, participants felt that they had very good skills and knowledge for working as TLCs. A more detailed examination of the data comparing rating means between the TLC Only, PT/TLC, and Non-TLC groups shows some other interesting trends.

Table 10 presents this data.

Table 10

Differences Between Self-Evaluations of Knowledge of Participants Categorized as TLC Only, Part-time TLC (PT/TLC), or Not Working as TLC (Non-TLC)

Item	Mean Rating		
	TLC Only	PT/TLC	Non-TLC
1. increase in knowledge of transitional models	3.75	4.33	4.33
2. know goals of vocational rehabilitation	4.13	4.56	4.56
3. able to assist OVR in school	4.00	4.78	3.72
4. able to provide data to OVR	4.50	4.89	4.11
5. able to conduct OVR/school staff meetings	4.00	4.33	3.89
6. know how to follow up referral to OVR	3.38	4.22	3.89
7. increase in knowledge of postsecondary services	3.63	3.89	4.11
8. increased ability to organize special activity	3.75	4.11	3.89
9. aware of school occupational programs	4.38	4.56	4.00
10. know how to connect work study and linkage	4.25	4.22	4.22
11. can organize parent programs	4.00	4.44	3.89

As the table indicates, in almost all categories the self identified part-time TLCs felt that they had more knowledge and competence than either those participants who listed themselves as TLC Only or those participants who were not self identified or engaged as TLCs. The fact that these participants (PT/TLC) identified themselves as TLCs even though they had other jobs might have contributed to their positive experience and self evaluation.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Interestingly also, on the three items measuring the development of knowledge (1, 7 and 8), members of both the PT/TLC and Non-TLC groups felt that they had increased their knowledge more than the TLC group. It may be that the more experience that participants had as TLCs, the more they felt they needed to know. Alternatively, TLCs may have come to the training sessions better equipped than the other groups and so were less likely to feel that they had gained in knowledge or competence.

A final comparison on this section was made between all participants who said they were engaged in TLC activities - TLC Only and PT/TLC - (i.e., those who had been given some release time to carry out the TLC function) and those who were not given any time for TLC activiies. Table 11 lists these means.

Table 11

Comparison of Self-Evaluations of Knowledge of All Identified TLC Participants and Non-TLC Participants

Item	Mean Rating	
	TLC Only and PT/TLC Combined	Non-TLC
1. increase in knowledge of transitional models	4.06	4.33
2. know goals of vocational rehabilitation	4.35	4.56
3. able to assist OVR in school	4.41	3.72
4. able to provide data to OVR	4.71	4.11
5. able to conduct OVR/school staff meetings	4.18	3.89
6. know how to follow up referral to OVR	3.82	3.89
7. increase in knowledge of postsecondary services	3.76	4.11
8. increased ability to organize special activity	3.94	3.89
9. aware of school occupational programs	4.47	4.00
10. know how to connect work study and linkage	4.24	4.22
11. can organize parent programs	4.24	3.89

Grouped in this way, it can be seen that in general the participants with TLC experience almost always saw themselves as having more skill than the inexperienced participants. Again, however, the inexperienced participants seemed to rate their own knowledge or gain in knowledge higher than that of the practicing TLC participants. It would appear then, that the program was most effective in imparting knowledge to more naive participants, but that participants' skills as

TLCs increased or developed in the context of actual experience.

3. Participants' Assessment of Need for Further Skill or Knowledge Development After Training

Participants were given a list of 12 skills and areas of knowledge that might be needed for effective functioning as a transitional linkage coordinator and asked to indicate which items were of greatest, moderate, or least concern to them. Again the respondents were divided into TLC Only, FT/TLC, and Non-TLC groups for purposes of data examination. Table 12 indicates the modal responses of each group for each skill listed.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Table 12

Modal Responses of Participants' Expressed Need for Increased Skills, Knowledge, and Support to Carry Out the Role of a TLC

Item	Modal Concern Response		
	TLC Only	PT/TLC	Non-TLC
1. Knowledge of local rehabilitation agencies	Great	Great	Great
2. How to secure parental involvement	Great	Great to Moderate	Great
3. Having supportive assistant principal	Great	Great	Great
4. Having time allotment for TLC activities	Moderate	Great	Great
5. Getting colleagues on transition team	Least	Moderate	Moderate
6. Skill in conducting exit interview	Moderate to Least	Least	Least
7. Developing relationship with OVR	Great to Moderate	Great	Great
8. Developing relationship with community employers	Moderate	Least	Moderate
9. Learning about labor market conditions	Moderate	Least	Moderate
10. How to secure additional vocational training in school	Moderate	Great	Great
11. Identifying opportunities at community colleges	Least	Moderate	Moderate
12. Obtaining assessment data	Least	Moderate	Moderate

The results listed in this table indicate that there was more disagreement between the three groups than agreement. For example, the Non-TLC group tended to regard more areas as of great concern than did the other two groups. Also the three groups agreed on only one issue as being of the least concern, that of needing to become more

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

skillful in conducting exit interviews.

Also of some interest is the fact that PT/TLCs and Non-TLCs tended to agree in their assessments more often than did PT/TLCs and those who identified themselves TLC Only (8 agreements vs. 2 agreements). This suggests again that when individuals are engaged in more frequent TLC activities, their needs may be different from those who engage less frequently or not at all in such activities.

Breaking the data down again into results from all TLC identified participants (TLC Only and PT/TLC) and Non-TLC participants, however, presents a somewhat different picture. These results appear in Table 13.

Table 13

Modal Responses of All TLC and Non-TLC Participants' Expressed Need for Increased Skills, Knowledge, and Support to Carry Out the Role of a TLC

Item	Modal Concern Response: TLC Only and PT/TLC Group	Modal Concern Response: Non-TLC Group
1. Knowledge of local rehabilitation agencies	Great	Great
2. How to secure parental involvement	Great	Great
3. Having supportive assistant principal	Great	Great
4. Having time allotment for TLC activities	Great	Great
5. Getting colleagues on transition team	Moderate	Moderate
6. Skill in conducting exit interview	Least	Least
7. Developing relationship with OVR	Great	Great
8. Developing relationship with community employers	Moderate to Least	Moderate
9. Learning about labor market conditions	Moderate	Moderate
10. How to secure additional vocational training in school	Great	Great
11. Identifying opportunities at community colleges	Least	Moderate
12. Obtaining assessment data	Least	Moderate

Broken down in this way, there is much more general agreement between both groups regarding their needs for training in the future. On three issues, however, they expressed different views. These items dealt with concerns about developing relationships with community employers, identifying opportunities at community colleges, and obtaining assessment data that was usable. In all three cases, the Non-TLC group saw a greater need for help in these areas. It may be that experience in actually carrying out the transition linkage process resulted in an increase in participants' knowledge and skill in these specific areas.

3. Changes in Extent of TLC Activity Engaged in Before and After Training

Participants were asked to rate their level of active participation in 17 TLC related activities prior to entering the program and since completing the program. The possible ratings ranged from 1 to 4 with 1 indicating never involved in the activity and 4 indicating a lot of involvement in the activity. Results were tabulated for the group as a whole and for TLC Only, PT/TLC, and Non-TLC subgroups. Table 14 presents a summary of mean ratings for each activity before and after training for the group as a whole. Table 15 presents the same data broken down by three subgroups and Table 16 presents the data broken down into two subgroups. Table 17 summarizes the overall amount of time spent in TLC activities by groups before and after training.

Table 14

Mean Ratings of Involvement in TLC Activities Before and After Training

Item	Before	After
1. determining transition services	2.68	3.53
2. developing transitional plan	2.04	3.32
3. conferring with work-study staff	2.68	3.56
4. conferring with guidance staff	2.88	3.48
5. conducting exit interviews	1.68	2.84
6. identifying community agencies	2.40	3.36
7. forming and working with transition planning team	1.52	2.80
8. conferring with parents	2.44	3.04
9. conferring with career ed staff	2.64	3.32
10. conferring with OVR	2.08	3.28
11. involvement in career day	1.88	2.92
12. learning about transitional employment	2.08	3.60
13. identifying potential employers	1.76	2.72
14. identifying transition students	2.04	3.38
15. identifying mainstream opportunities	2.48	3.12
16. conferring with college coordinators	1.88	2.71
17. getting special education students to participate in career day events	1.83	2.71

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Table 15

Mean Ratings of Involvement in TLC Activities Before and After Training by Subgroups

Item	TLC Only		PT/TLC		Non-TLC	
	Bef	Aft	Bef	Aft	Bef	Aft
1. determining transition services	2.14	3.71	2.67	3.78	3.11	3.56
2. developing transitional plan	1.43	3.29	2.11	3.56	2.22	3.11
3. conferring with work-study staff	2.71	3.86	2.44	3.44	2.89	3.44
4. conferring with guidance staff	2.86	3.57	2.89	3.44	2.89	3.44
5. conducting exit interviews	1.14	3.00	1.78	3.11	2.00	2.44
6. identifying community agencies	1.86	3.43	2.44	3.44	2.78	3.22
7. forming and working with transition planning team	1.29	1.71	1.44	2.56	1.78	2.89
8. conferring with parents	2.29	3.14	2.33	3.00	2.67	3.00
9. conferring with career ed staff	2.14	3.29	2.67	3.33	3.00	3.33
10. conferring with OVR	1.86	3.29	2.33	3.78	2.00	2.78
11. involvement in career day	1.57	2.71	1.56	2.67	2.44	3.33
12. learning about transitional employment	1.57	3.71	2.22	3.78	2.33	3.33
13. identifying potential employers	1.29	3.00	1.44	2.33	2.44	2.89
14. identifying transition students	1.57	3.86	2.22	3.56	2.44	3.11
15. identifying mainstream opportunities	2.29	3.00	2.00	2.89	2.89	3.44
16. conferring with college coordinators	1.57	2.43	1.78	2.56	2.25	3.13
17. getting special education students to participate in career day events	1.57	2.14	1.56	2.78	2.38	3.13
Mean Overall Change	1.83	3.20	2.11	3.17	2.50	3.15

Table 15

Mean Ratings of Involvement in TLC Activities Before and After Training by Two Subgroups

Item	TLC Only and PT/TLC		Non-TLC	
	Bef	Aft	Bef	Aft
1. determining transition services	2.35	3.41	3.11	3.56
2. developing transitional plan	1.71	3.24	2.22	3.11
3. conferring with work-study staff	2.41	3.41	2.89	3.44
4. conferring with guidance staff	2.76	3.29	2.89	3.44
5. conducting exit interviews	1.41	2.88	2.00	2.44
6. identifying community agencies	2.06	3.24	2.78	3.22
7. forming and working with transition planning team	1.29	2.59	1.78	2.89
8. conferring with parents	2.18	2.88	2.67	3.00
9. conferring with career ed staff	2.29	3.12	3.00	3.33
10. conferring with OVR	2.00	3.35	2.00	2.78
11. involvement in career day	1.47	2.53	2.44	3.33
12. learning about transitional employment	1.82	3.53	2.33	3.33
13. identifying potential employers	1.29	2.47	2.44	2.89
14. identifying transition students	1.82	3.47	2.44	3.11
15. identifying mainstream opportunities	2.00	2.76	2.89	3.44
16. conferring with college coordinators	1.59	2.35	2.25	3.13
17. getting special education students to participate in career day events	1.47	2.35	2.38	3.13
Mean Overall Change	1.98	3.19	2.50	3.15

Table 17

Mean Rating of Time Spent on Overall TLC Activities Before and After Training by Subgroups

Group	Mean Rating of Time Spent	
	Before Training	After Training
TLC Only	1.93	3.20
PT/TLC	2.11	3.17
Non-TLC	2.30	3.15

These tables indicate that all groups increased their participation in TLC activities over the course of the training period. For the group as a whole, there were increases in all categories of activity.

A comparison of TLC Only, PT/TLC, and Non-TLC groups in Table 15, however, indicates that the TLC Only group reported the greatest overall increase in TLC activities, while the Non-TLC group had the smallest increase in TLC activities. This would be expected, since more activity should have been carried out by those who spent the most time in the coordinator role. However, a closer examination of the mean ratings of each group (see Table 17) indicates that, surprisingly before training, the Non-TLC group claimed to have spent more time in overall TLC activities than either of the other groups and that the PT/TLC group spent more time in the activities than the TLC Only group. However, by the end of training all groups claimed to be spending about the same amount of time in TLC activities in general.

Tables 15 and 16 present some other surprising findings in terms of the individual categories of activities. For example, after training, the Non-TLC group reported a somewhat greater amount of time spent in

10 of the 17 categories as compared to the TLC Only and PT/TLC groups individually and combined. In contrast, both TLC groups spent more time than the Non-TLC group in the other seven categories of activities. The result is that even though overall the TLC and Non-TLC groups claimed to have spent the same amount of time in program related activities, there were differences in the specific activities each engaged in the most. The TLC Only and PT/TLC groups tended to be more involved in conducting exit interviews, conferring with OVR, learning about transitional employment, and identifying transitional students. In contrast the Non-TLC group tended to spend more time engaged in forming and working with a transition team at school, having special education students participate in schoolwide career day, identifying potential employers, identifying mainstream opportunities in the school, and conferring with coordinators at colleges. In general, it appears that the TLC participants were more engaged in actively identifying and placing students while the Non-TLC group was more involved in gathering infomation and working with students within the school setting.

Further, other differences in the extent to which activities were engaged in also appeared. For example, as indicated in Table 16, each of the groups showed the most change in different activities. For the group that identified itself as TLC Only, the greatest increase in activity was in time spent identifying transition students and learning about transitional employent. For the group that identified itself as engaging part-time in TLC activities, the greatest increases were in developing transitional plans, assuming laisson responsibility with an OVR counselor, and learning about transitional employment. For the group that identified itself as Non-TLC, the greatest activity

increase was in organizing a transition planning team and conducting meetings.

In summary, all participants increased the amount of time spent on TLC activites. The greatest increases were found in the groups that had time set aside specifically to carry out TLC activities. These participants tended to engage more in activities that involved placement and contact with rehabilitation agencies, such as OVR. Participants who did not have specific time set aside for TLC activities, tended to confine their time more to in-school personnel and events. Moreover, although these latter participants seemed to feel that they devoted a fairly large amount of their time to TLC activities both before and after training, their estimation may have been exaggerated because they had to do these activities within the confines of their regular work activities.

4. Reports of the Processes Used in a Successfully Resolved Transition Case

Participants were asked to report on a single case that represented a successful effort to implement a transition linkage plan. Responses were categorized according to the following criteria:

1. Events reported were not related to the training of the program (i.e., they may have described a success story from a previous year)

2. Events reported did not give details about the respondents the role as a TLC

3. Events reported were well organized and detailed regarding the transition process

4. No specific case was reported, but meetings or organizational efforts were described instead

Table 18 indicates the percentage of responese made in each category

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

for the group of participants as a whole.

Table 18

Percent of Types of Success Stories Reported

Category of Response	Percent of All Responses
Not related to program	15
Specific, but TLC role not detailed	20
Organized and detailed case presented	50
Meetings, presentations or organizational efforts reported	15

A similar breakdown of responses is reported in Table 19 for the subgroups of partipants.

Table 19

Percent of Types of Success Stories Reported by Subgroups

Category of Response	Percent of All Responses		
	TLC Only	PT/TLC	Non-TLC
Not related to program	25	0	22
Specific, but TLC role not detailed	25	22	11
Organized and detailed case presented	38	67	44
Meetings, presentations or organizational efforts reported	12	11	22

These results seem to indicate that participants in the part-time TLC group were most diligent in reporting their success stories in detail and that they tended to apply their learning experience skillfully. The members of the TLC Only group seemed less able to

distinguish events that had evolved as a function of training from those that were part of their job before the training. They also surprisingly had the lowest proportion of well detailed organized reports of TLC activities engaged in on the success story case. Some members of all groups avoided focusing on the transition process and became more involved in reporting on the more general counseling role that they played. Overall, though, based on their case reports the majority of the participants seem to have been able to incorporate some aspects of the training program into their roles as transition linkage coordinators.

Examples of a few success stories appear below.

From a TLC Only participant:

> "Sydney entered his senior year this past fall. He had at that point accumulated 30+ credits, however, he had had nt passed any RCT's. As his grade advisor, I asked to meet with his parents to report that it would be unlikely that Sydney would pass the RCT's needed to receive a diploma. His parents and Sydney agreed that if he did not accomplish this by June, he would graduate with an IEP diploma. I recommended that Sydney apply for vocational training. As a TLC, I placed Sydney in a concurrent program that involved carpentry training with the Vocational Training Center in the morning and a return to high school in the afternoon for academic instruction.
>
> Sydney has done well and hopes to be placed in a permanent position after June. With my recommendation, Sydney has also applied for the New York City Traffic Enforcment Agent Test. The elegibility for this test requires only a driver's license and no formal education. The base salary is $19,000. I think Sydney is capable of passing this test since his reading level is approximately at the fifth grade level. He is very enthusiastic!"

From a TLC Only participant:

> "-Third year freshman" who was consistently truant
> -Met with student
> -Met with mother
> -Discussions with guidance counselor
> -Met with student and mother
> -Set up appointment for student interview at New York

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Vocational
-Student attended second appointment
-Student transferred to New York Vocational with enthusiasm and parental approval"

From a PT/TLC participant:

"The student had graduated from high school six months before the TLC program started. When I heard about the program and received the information I -
1. Called her mother on the phone and discussed the program
2. She indicated she was interested
3. Spoke to the Job Path person after receiving flyers about their program for our students
4. Was informed about sending student records to him
5. Parental permission was given for student records to be sent over (history, psychological, medical evaluaion, and IEP goals)
6. Records sent to Job Path - this was before I was informed about who the school linkage person was)
7. Received a letter from OVR stating that I must in the future send eligible studets names to them first
8. OVR received the records
9. Called parent to see if she heard from OVR - Yes, an interview was set up with OVR counselfor, parent and student
10. Student had to have a medical-vision screening
11. Two months later student saw me in the street and said she had had a vision test - I called her mother again
12. Mother said daughter was asked to select a job - salesgirl, stockroom, mailroom
13. Student selected to be trained to work in the mailroom"

From PT/TLC participant:

"A graduating senior receiving a regular high school diploma had no postsecondary plans for pursuing a career or further education. The following steps were taken:
1. I had the student complete an interest survey
2. We had a conference about postsecondary plans
-what are her interests (nursing)
-realistic possibilities (nurse's aide)
-how to approach this career (2 year college program)
3. Applications were completed to several colleges
-was accepted to Bronx Community College learning disabled program, so far
4. Later interview with her mother was held. Themother has a negative attitude of her daughter. The student and I discussed this and she is determined to succeed regardless of the obstacles - we are still hoping that she will be accepted to a school with dorms

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

5. Arrangements were made with a counselor to visit Bronx Community College. Student also followed through with the placement exam

6. Student is receiving additional reading and writing skills so that she will be better prepared for college

7. We are planning to meet with the personnel from the learning disabilities program at Bronx Community College so that the student can be aware of all the possibilites and ask questions"

From a PT/TLC participant:

"Although I do not work with students, I had a very successful experience as a presenter of information to colleagues who will be taking the TLC course next term. The following steps were responsible for the presentation s success-

o A great deal of planning went into the presentation.

o I had to decide just how much information to present and in what depth so that the presentation would be a stimulating overview and not a lengthy lecture.

o I had to assess the audience s needs so that I could try to meet them. I had to prepare an agenda and include a group activity which would encourage participation and interest.

o I had to locate an article on the transition process for audience members to take back with them.

I can say that learning the valuable informaion that was presented to me during this last school year made me knowledgeable and interesting enough to inspire others to increase their knowledge and offer their services to te transitional process."

From a Non-TLC participant

"1. Virna S. - senior - no career goals

2. Informal talk with student to discuss career goals (work, college, OVR)

3. The benefits of OVR were discussed along with an honest assessment of the student's abilities

4. Student agreed to a meeting with OVR counselor

5. Phone interview with parent followed

6. Meeting with OVR counselor in school

7. Documentation and necessary forms were completed and submitted to OVR along with school records

8. OVR office visit by student was arranged

9. Informal talk with student after OVR visit - student expressed an interest in working in a hospital

10. Student request was discussed with OVR counselor (on phone) and available options were discussed

11. Student completed intake

12. Training began at North Shore University Hospital - clerical/data entry trainging

13. When student finishes training she will be placed in a hospital with a respectable starting salary"

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

These samples of the reports made by participants of their successful TLC efforts are representative of the majority of the responses. Although all participants did not offer such detailed information, those that did, serve to document the success of the training program. The fact that some of the program participants are able to train colleagues and many are able to apply the knowledge and techniques gained from the training sessions, provides strong evidence that the first year of the program has achieved its goals.

Summary and Conclusions

Examination of the assessment instruments used during the first year of the TLC project indicates that the program has been successful in attaining its goals and that with very few modifications, should continue to do so in subsequent project years.

Future involvement of participants should pay close attention to the factors that allow or support the TLC position in school sites. The provision of release time to carry out the function so that it can be intergrated into regular school assignments seems to have a particularly powerful and positive effect on participants attitudes and ability to function in the TLC role.

In addition, if possible a little more discussion and question time should be allotted during presentations. Similarly, increased opportunities for group interaction and sharing activiies should be emphasized a bit more in the next project year. With only these slight modifications, an already successful program should become even more effective.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

APPENDIX II

Transition Linkage Coordinators
Evaluation of Training Program
Year II

TRANSITION LINKAGE COORDINATORS

Evaluation of Training Program
Year II

Milton J. Gold

Institute for Research and Development
in Occupational Education
Center for Advanced Study in Education
The Graduate School and University Center
of the City University of New York

June 1990
CASE #06-90

Transition Linkage Coordinators
Evaluation of Training Program: Year II

This report on the program for staff development of Transition Linkage Coordinators (TLC) stems from post-session evaluations submitted by participants, from a comprehensive evaluation by participants of the program as a whole, and from interviews with participants and the program directors. Information is presented on organization of the program, the motivation of participants in joining it, gains they reported in knowledge, attitudes and understanding, the effects of field experiences, networking that arose from the program, reactions to instructional leaders, and recommendations for changes in the program.

Interview Data

1. Who participated in the program?

All of the participants held some instructional or supervisory function within Special Education Departments in New York City High Schools. Most of them carried partial teaching loads. They also had part-time assignments as grade advisors, special education coordinators, or they had new assignments as transition linkage coordinators. Six participants were interviewed. These persons had an average of 15 years teaching experience, most or all of it in special education. Their assignments were, for the most part, with learning disabled or emotionally handicapped students.

The majority of participants were special education personnel working in individual schools. The target population initally had been one special educator from each high school in the selected boroughs. A number of supervisors from borough superintendents' offices also took part to begin with, but they dropped out during or after the first semester because they had no school population to work with in the field experience segment of the program. Future recruiting will exclude persons not assigned to a school, as distinct from a borough office. Persistence in the program of school-based individuals was relatively good, taking into consideration inevitable withdrawals for reasons of personal exigency.

2. Why did they enroll in the program?

In general, participants enrolled in the program because of concern for the future of students with handicapping conditions when they would be leaving or graduating from high school. Participants were interested in enhancing their activity in career education. Other reasons were also given. Some participants were attracted by the five graduate credits they would earn. Others had no need for additional credits. A few were interested in preparing for supervisory licenses and one of these was working on a doctorate in administration and supervision. One person said he knew that the position of TLC would be established formally and he felt the learnings would be valuable to students in the next few years. These varied kinds of motivation may guide recruitment efforts in future years.

3. Pertinent aspects of the organization of the program.

The project leaders took various steps to promote establishment of a TLC position as a regular part of special education on the high school level. These steps included careful observance of protocol in involving high school special education administrators at the central office of the Board of Education as well as executive assistants to superintendents on the borough level. The program was described in the monthly meetings of assistant principals in charge of special education in the high schools, and they were asked to submit the names of persons who should be invited to participate. Project staff, in a memorandum sent to high school assistants-to-principal of special education, indicated that primary criteria for participant selection were to include (1) experience in working with the office of Vocational and Educational Services for Individuals with Disabilities (VESID), in transition programs and/or in conducting career education, work-study, or occupational training programs, and (2) the recommendation by a special education assistant-to-principal or supervisor. Attending the initial training session were the executive assistant for high school special education from both the central and borough offices, a representative from VESID, and the coordinator of transition training at the central office. These persons constitute an advisory committee which meets two or three times a year to discuss such matters as selection criteria, progress of the program, feedback from current and former participants, and efforts to institutionalize transition programs and the training of TLCs.

4. Didactic Elements

4.1 Role perception. The TLC position is a new assignment in New York City high schools. Individuals reported they had little knowledge of the TLC's role to begin with, but, in the course of the program they developed an understanding of what students need in making a transition to postsecondary education or to the work world. This understanding led to realization of the potential of the TLC position in helping students in this process. Directors distributed and led discussion of a manual on transition published in Georgia.

4.2 The process of transition. Participants were given help in "making the transition easy" for students and in working out transition plans with them.

4.3 Understanding. To begin with, participants reported new awareness of the need of students for help in making the transition, of their need to avoid "graduating and no place to go." They said they learned that students need to know that they do have opportunities for work or further education, that the diploma is not the be all and end all, and that one has to get ready for the world one will live in and work in. Broader understandings were also reported--that many things are in transition, not just college or work. As one participant said, "It helped me see things I hadn't been aware of."

4.4 Information on resources. An important outcome was learning of resources for the handicapped, both in vocations and in post secondary education. First, participants "gained a wider scope of where I should look." They discovered programs for students who would not get a diploma and alternative programs for students not succeeding in school. They learned of resources in the field like VESID, and the International Center for the Disabled (ICD), and other agencies to link students when leaving school. Participants said they can now give students career options, having new information to help students gain employment. For students succeeding in school, they learned of programs in trade schools and in colleges which provide "bridge programs" for learning disabled students.

4.5 Information about the labor market.

Participants welcomed information they received on the labor market trends and local market analysis. They cited three sources: outside speakers, the program directors, and materials reprinted from a number of journals. One person

complained that there was so much material she couldn't read it all. The directors regarded this comment as a misinterpretation: the materials were intended as the beginning of a resource file each participants could assemble, not necessarily as overnight reading matter.

4.6 Attitudes of business toward employment of the handicapped. Presentations by representatives of the private and public sectors (e.g., IBM and the Port Authority, respectively) reassured participants on employment possibilities for their students. Companies, they heard, are willing to make allowances for handicaps. Jobs are available where persons like their students can work to the satisfaction of their employers. Large organizations are readier than small companies to accept such employees. Participants spoke of continuing contact with former students and their supervisors for a year or two after leaving. One suggested the value of a workshop for employers on hiring and supervising the handicapped.

4.7 Postsecondary opportunities. Speakers from community and senior colleges described programs that are being offered to students with academic deficiencies. In addition, a representative of VESID indicated services his organization could provide in making the transition to college, and participants reported working as a team with a VESID member to plan college preparatory strategies for students. They discovered that admission is not only possible, but that some institutions offer "bridge" programs which provide remedial and developmental work for students needing it. Employment services are also offered to students who enroll. This information came as a suprise to many participants who had not been aware of growing flexibility on the part of colleges.

4.8 Outside speakers. Participants gave high marks to the speakers who made presentations. They felt that speakers were realistic in assessing employment possibilities for school leavers and postsecondary opportunities for students who would continue their education. As regards process, the project directors were more critical, recognizing that some speakers tended to exceed the time allotted to them; some dwelt too long on the structure of their organization, and some were less than dynamic. They indicated a possible move in the future to a format making use of panels at times instead of speakers appearing in series.

4.9 Programming students in high school to prepare for careers. Participants looked at the TLC's role in programming special education students. This involved

helping new students when they enter the school, finding the aptitudes that students have, not only intellectual but also manual as well. Programming was viewed not as a one-shot deal, but as organizing a vocational or academic sequence. Selecting students for work-study programs was also discussed even though such cooperative programs might be the responsibility of another special education coordinator.

4.10 The TLC's role as a counselor. Participants spoke of forming a bond with students, of having them know "that you're there at all times," still there to help them after they leave school. The TLC's role is to help students relate to school, to the subjects they take, and to jobs they find or aspire to. They acknowledged help of program directors to them as counselors: "They confirmed and validated what I'm doing, broke down a sense of isolation."

4.11 Working with parents. Responding to advice to involve parents in the transition process, they cited the financial problems of parents who might lose a day's pay in order to see the TLC. They appreciated learning what other coordinators were doing who succeeded in setting up interviews with parents.

5. Field experiences, practicum and assignments

The TLC training program extended out from the classroom to field trips, visits to participants in their school, and assignments oriented to transition linkage. A visit was made to the International Center for the Disabled which does vocational evaluation of handicapped persons and provides vocational training on site.

The practicum took the form of consultation by the project director with participants at their school site. Participants planned projects which the directors reviewed with them. These projects were unique to particular schools and included such items as producing a videotape, holding a career day for special education students, and developing a collaborative curriculum with the business community. Directors observed lessons on transition given by participants, who conducted general and exit interviews, and case conferences. In the main, the directors engaged in problem solving with participants, helping them to overcome hurdles as they went about instituting a transition linkage program.

Four assignments were completed by participants:

- Developing a profile of the school, identifying the resources and services available. Students reported surprise at the existence of resources of which they were not aware.

- Preparing a critique of a Georgia monograph on transition linkage which provides a picture of the process.
- Developing a case load of eight students and a plan of operation for their transition from high school.
- Preparing a plan for a practicum activity.

6. Networking

Participants referred to networking taking place both during the seminars and outside them between sessions. They spoke of telephone conversations, using each other's resources, building a sense of trust, and sharing among members of the group. Setting up a course of study profited from discussion with other persons. One participant noted that this networking had "broken down my sense of isolation. What others do serves as validation for my operation."

7. Participants' evaluation of program and instructors

All participants interviewed expressed enthusiasm for the program and its organization. They liked the combination of general sessions featuring speakers with smaller group sessions where they had more opportunity to participate and especially to exchange ideas with their colleagues. They approved the "bull session" taking place as the final portion of most meetings where they could throw a variety of problems into the hopper. They were happy to see what others were doing and appreciated participation from "graduates" of the previous year's program.

Adjectives they used to describe their instructors (the project directors) were "realistic," "knowledgeable," "sharing expertise," "incisive," "aware of what is going on," and "expert in understanding and enhancing dynamics among people."

8. Handbook

Publication of a handbook on transiton linkage is currently in planning. Several participants have been relieved of other assignments in order to prepare a draft which will be reviewed by others in the group. The revised draft is to be sumbitted to TLCs who will review the material and make recommendations for further revision.

9. Changes recommended by participants and project directors.

Participants suggested various changes in the program, some representing only one person's opinion:

- More contact sessions--touch base more frequently
- Visit companies employing the handicapped to see them in action on the job and to interview them concerning job opportunities and work attitudes
- Develop two tracks in the training program to target those with more and those with less experience and sophistication
- More practical suggestions on how the TLC job can be done
- Definition of what TLC should do in one's school
- More structured, less process-oriented program with greater emphasis on didactic segment.

Project directors were hoping that the school board would allow more time to TLCs to devote to the transition process. With respect to the training program they made these suggestions:

- Take greater care in selecting participants, including persons with more experience, and those in a situation where a practicum project is possible,
- Plan to include more field trips
- Identify speakers who are dynamic and will adhere to time limit; utilize panel rather than solo speakers so that they can dialogue with each other on the relevance of services offered and possibilities of collaborating with each other
- Bring central office coordinator into more sessions
- Continuously reconsider what we do.

10. Conclusion

The Transition Linkage Coordinator training program offers a good mix of didactic and practicum experiences for participants. A full menu of information is offered concerning problems and opportunities that students with handicaps experience upon leaving high school, either for the work world or for postsecondary education. The expertise of the project directors was supplemented by a number of speakers representing the private and public sectors, agencies for the handicapped, trade schools, and community and senior colleges. Complementing presentations by speakers was a wealth of printed material.

The program provided participants with a workable picture of the functions of a TLC. Field experience added realism to the didactic sessions, but even more impressive is the assistance given by the project directors to participants through visits to their schools, observation of their procedures in the schools, and problem solving with them.

Providing possibility of graduate course credit carried with it the opportunity to call for completion of outside assignments. These assignments were relevant to the functioning of a TLC and related both to the seminars and to the visits made by the directors to participants.

Participants were highly positive in their evaluation of the program as a whole as well as in their assessment of individual sessions. It was apparent that they were growing in personal security as well as knowledgeability as pertains to their TLC assignment. In addition, they were forming their own network for communication and mutual self-help in the future.

Recommendations for change came from participants and project staff as well. They have been detailed above and should be considered in the light of time and resource constraints--and in the light of the staff's best judgment of the appropriateness and realism of the suggestions.

Demographic Data

At the last session of the course, participants completed a demographic data form.

Twelve of the 15 participants who attended the last session of the course submitted responses to a questionnaire which included demographic data and evaluative comments on the program. Respondents averaged 10.58 years experience as teachers, 8.5 of them in special education. All twelve had served as classroom teachers, 6 as work study coordinators, 2 as deans, 11 as TLCs, 9 as VESID liaison, and 3 as grade advisors. In addition, they reported assignments as coordinators of special education, a variety of special projects, progam advisors, editor/writer of a newsletter, attendance and resource room coordinators, and one as a member of the borough superintendent's staff.

The respondents reported an average of 13.1 periods per week on TLC activities, with an average of 4.6 administrative periods per week assigned for TLC

work. Average teaching load was 4.1 periods per day. These figures exclude one teacher who has had only 2 years experience and no TLC assignment.

Participants' Evaluations

1. Post-Session Evaluation

Participants completed an evaluation form after most of the monthly sessions and also responded to a more comprehensive evaluation during the last meeting of the program.

Part I of the post-session evaluation asked participants to check reasons why they liked the day's session. Combined totals for all sessions that were evaluated follow, indicating the most positive reactions to receipt of new information, the knowledgeability and preparation of the presenters, and the practicality of ideas they offered:

a. I received new information.	120
b. some ideas I heard before were presented in new ways.	55
c. the presenters were knowledgeable.	118
d. the presenters were well prepared.	105
e. the ideas presented were practical.	90
f. I obtained useful information about resource materials.	61
g. I learned from the group sharing interaction.	65
h. I took away some ideas and/or techniques to "try out" on the job.	54

Part II of the post-session evaluation asked participants to describe one item in the day's session that seemed of value to them. Respondents listed the following items:

General point of view

- Functions and role of the TLC
- Focus on abilities, not disabilities, of their students

School operation

- Curriculum for transition linkage
- Knowledge useful for students
- Model for work-study programs
- Concept of simulating jobs

Information for transition

- VESID operation

Agencies for evaluation, counseling and training

Job market profile

Placement opportunities for handicapped persons

Public sector placement

Private sector placement

Programs, including support services, in higher education

Part III of the questionnaire asked participants to complete the statement, "I would have liked this session better if. . ." Responses included:

Process suggestions

More time

More films

Video showing clients in transition linkage situations

Meeting clients who had made successful transitions

More activities, fewer lectures

Substance suggestions

Seeing transition process in action: application, interview, training

Clearer picture of criteria for admission to transition programs

List of specific entry level jobs

Contacts for jobs in work-study program

More information on blue collar jobs

Part IV asked for an over-all evaluation of each session, on a scale from 1 (poor) to 5 (outstanding). The average for all sessions was 3.67, "above aveage," with individual sessions securing ratings from 2.88 to 4.31.

2. Final Participant Evaluation

Participant evaluation included a comprehensive questionnaire distributed at the last session of the program. The questionnaire was in four parts. Part I asked participants to rate on a scale from 5 (to a large extent) to 1 (very little) skills, knowledge and attitudes related to participation in the TLC program. The ratings were all very high with the exception of a more moderate rating for the item on "feedback and follow-up mechanism to monitor and track students' progress in the VESID referral "pipeline."

PART I

Rating of skills, knowledge, attitudes related to your participating in the TLC program.

1. My knowledge of transition models and the elements and program components of the transition process has increased:

To a large extent				Very little
5	4	3	2	1

average 4.58

2. My understanding of the vocational rehabilitation process including: goals of vocational rehabilitation, role of VESID, services provided, VESID eligibility requirements, and VESID procedures is:

average 4.0

3. My competencies in assisting the VESID counselor learn about the structure of my school and our special education program are:

average 4.42

4. My ability to provide VESID personnel with data about special education students needed for making a referral to VESID is:

average 4.67

5. My skill in conducting meetings with VESID personnel and school staff to review the status of students who are likely clients for VESID is:

average 4.25

6. I know what is needed to develop a feedback and follow-up mechanism to monitor and track students progress in the VESID referral "pipeline":

average 3.83

7. My awareness of programs and special services for handicapped students at local postsecondary institutions and rehabilitation agencies has increased:

average 4.42

8. My awareness and skill of how to organize a special activity such as career fair as a means of starting a linkage process with community resources have increased:

average 4.0

9. My knowledge of occupational programs and special programs in my school which might be appropriate for special education students is:

average 4.67

10. My ability and knowledge of how to incorporate the outcomes of work study programs for special education into the linkage process are:

average 4.42

11. My ability on how to organize programs aimed at informing parents about VESID, postsecondary training options and employment possibilities is:

average 4.0

Part II of the evaluation asked participants to rank a number of items in three groups, A, B, and C, according to need and concern. These instructions were misinterpreted by many respondents who, instead, assigned A, B, and C ratings without regard to the number in each group. For purposes of tabulation, these letters have been converted to 3 (A), 2, and 1 in decreasing order of need and concern.

	Avg.	Item
1.	2.25	securing more knowledge of local rehabilitation agencies
2.	2.67	learning how to secure parental involvement
3.	2.5	having an assistant principal who is supportive of the transition process
4.	2.67	having specific time allotment for TLC activities
5.	1.5	getting colleagues to serve on the transition team
6.	1.67	being more skillful in conducting an exit interveiw
7.	2.75	developing a working relationship with VESID
8.	2.08	developing a working relationship with employers in the community
9.	1.42	learning about labor market conditions in the community

Avg.	Item
10. 2.25	being able to secure additional vocational training opportunities in the school for special education students
11. 2.0	identifying postsecondary training opportunities at local community colleges
12. 2.08	obtaining usable assessment data.
13. 1.33	planning special events (e.g. Career Day, trips to business and industry.
14. 1.83	maintaining transition files and records (e.g. logs, diaries).
15 1.83	infusing career information into the regular subject matter curriculum.

It may be seen, therefore, that participants expressed greatest concern over developing a working relationship with VESID, learning how to secure parental involvement, having a specific time allocation for TLC activity, having a supportive assistant principal, securing more vocational opportunities for their students, and securing more knowledge of local rehabilitation agencies.

Part III attempts to secure data on the effect of the program. For each item, an average "before" and "now" is given. Ratings of the person with only two years experience have been omitted. Ratings of the other 11 respondents have been totalled in the "before" and "now" columns, and a third column gives the ratio between the "before" and "now" ratings. Finally, a "before"-"now" rating is given for each of these eleven participants.

	BEFORE	NOW	RATIO NOW/BEFORE
1. determining transition services needed by students	Never A lot 1 2 3 4 Total 24	Never A lot 1 2 3 4 Total 42	1.75
2. developing a transitional plan (formal and informal) for students)	Never A lot Total 21	Never A lot Total 44	2.10
3. conferring with colleagues who run work-study programs	Never A lot Total 24	Never A lot Total 34	1.42
4. conferring with guidance personnel on referral needs to ensure appropriate services will be provided	Never A lot Total 28	Never A lot Total 43	1.54
5. conducting exit interviews	Never A lot Total 19	Never A lot Total 38	2.0
6. identifying community agencies who provide services to special education students after they leave school	Never A lot Total 27	Never A lot Total 43	1.59
7. organizing a transition planning team and conducting meetings	Never A lot Total 17	Never A lot Total 38	2.24
8. conferring with parents regarding transition plans	Never A lot Total 23	Never A lot Total 38	1.65
9. conferring with vocational education and career education staff	Never A lot Total 22	Never A lot Total 34	1.55
10. assuming liaison responsibility with a VESID counselor or conferring with a colleague who is the VESID liaison	Never A lot Total 22	Never A lot Total 42	1.91
11. having special education students participate in a schoolwide or departmental career day	Never A lot Total 19	Never A lot Total 34	1.79
12. learning about transitional employment and supported employment	Never A lot Total 23	Never A lot Total 41	1.78
13. identifying local businesses who are potential employers	Never A lot Total 21	Never A lot Total 36	1.71

	BEFORE	NOW	RATIO NOW/BEFORE
14. targeting names of students for transition planning and coordinating data management	Never A lot Total 25	Never A lot Total 42	1.68
15. identifying mainstream opportunities e.g.: special projects, programs, or vocational classes that would benefit special education students	Never A lot Total 30	Never A lot Total 41	1.37
16. conferring with coordinators of handicapped services at local community or four year colleges	Never A lot Total 17	Never A lot Total 33	1.94
17. seeing that special education students participate in school-wide career day activities.	Never A lot Total 18	Never A lot Total 34	1.89

The change reported for each participant is expressed as a ratio of the now-to-before usage for all items combined:

Participant	Ratio
1	3.88
2	1.51
3	1.07
4	2.62
5	1.62
6	1.75
7	1.21
8	1.86
9	1.97
10	1.59
11	2.65

A ratio of 1.0 indicates no change from "before" to "now". Higher ratios predominate, indicating moderate to extensive effect of the program.

Part IV of the evaluation asked participants to describe a "successful" transition story of one student with whom they had worked as a TLC. Practically all of the respondents provided such an account. The cases they cited included students

who were learning disabled, emotionally disturbed, or physically handicapped. Learning disabled cases generally included arrangements for evaluation, counseling, and cooperative planning with VESID, leading to developing a career or educational "road map." Students were enrolled in work-study plans or placed in part-time employment in some cases. They were helped to form realistic views of future careers or schooling, to explore various vocational training or higher educational opportunities, to find jobs or to gain admission to, and financial aid in, colleges. Two emotionally disturbed students were helped to modify their behavior, and through job placement adjust to their problems and their environment. In some cases, contact was maintained after students left school. The anecdotes helped to document success of their assignment as TLCs.

Conclusion

The training program for Transition Linkage Coordinators succeeded in orienting participants to the role and functions of a new position in special education. All but one of the 15 persons completing the program were well experienced special educators, functioning both as classroom teachers and as guidance personnel or coordinators of special programs. Most were already designated as TLCs.

Participants benefitted from monthly didactic sessions and on-site visits from consultants who reviewed with them their special projects as well as their performance as TLCs. Evaluation of the seminars was positive. On a scale from 1 (poor) to 5 (outstanding), the average rating of individual sessions ranged from 2.88 to 4.31, with an average of 3.67 (above average) for the whole series. Asked to rate specific items, participants checked most frequently new information, knowledgeability and preparation of presenters, and practicality of the ideas presented.

In a final evaluation, participants rated skills, knowledge and attitudes related to their training activities, assigning average scores from 3.83 to 4.67 on a scale from 1 to 5. Appropriateness to their students, knowledge of transition models, ability to work with VESID personnel, and awareness of program and services for handicapped students received top ranking. Among needs and concerns in carrying out their role as TLC, participants listed as most important developing a working

relationship with VESID, learning how to secure parent involvement, having a specific time allotment for TLC activities, and having a supportive assistant principal.

Of special interest were the participants' response to questions asking them to rate their own transition linkage activities before their entry into the training program as compared with their current activity. Seventeen activities were listed, and participants were asked to report their involvement in these activities from 1 (never) to 4 (a lot). Ratings for the 17 behaviors totaled 380 "before," and 659 "now," yielding a ratio of 1.73. This may be interpreted to mean that participants almost doubled their activities in the course of the training program. The ratios for individual TLCs ranged rom 1.07 (little increase in activity) to 3.88 (almost four times as much).

Finally, participants were asked to describe one case where they felt they had helped a student make a successful transition. This anecdotal evidence indicated both the potential of transition linkage activity and the feeling of accomplishment that such activity brought to the TLCs.

Project staff and participants made a number of suggestions for improvement in the program detailed on page 7 of this report. The most viable suggestions appear to be those that would make the TLC function more tangible through greater personal contact with clients, agencies, potential employers and postsecondary institutions and through use of audio-visual media.

APPENDIX III

Managing Transition Services
More Effectively

Managing Transition Services More Effectively

by Mildred K. Lee and David Katz

Background

The average person spends 14 years in school, 20 years raising children, *and* 45 years in a job, occupation, or profession. These startling statistics, which highlight that most people spend more time working than with other important aspects of their lives, makes it clear that career decisions have tremendous impact on people's perceptions of personal success and societal contribution.

Educators, who have the task of preparing young people for the marketplace, bear the responsibility for assisting students - both able-bodied and with disabilities - to make the transition from school to postsecondary training, and, eventually, to employment. In addition to the personal satisfaction and economic pride that students derive from making career choices based on self-awareness, career information, and "hands-on" exploratory job experiences, benefits accrue to society.

America is a leader in the world market, in research, and in technology. Now and through the 21st century, this country will need well trained individuals in varied and diverse fields in order to compete. In order to maintain its international industrial leadership in the year 2000 and beyond, the United States will need every worker - educated to the utmost limits of her or his potential.

The Office of Vocational and Educational Services for Individuals with Disabilities (formerly OVR) has long been in the forefront of the "transitioning" process, by providing linkages for students from school to training and/or to employment. The Office of Vocational and Educational Services for Individuals with Disabilities (VESID) was reorganized to reflect an expanded mission, with increased State Education Department involvement, for direct coordination and advocacy in meeting the needs of people with disabilities. VESID's revised mission is congruent with the aims and objectives of the transition process described later in this article.

Active cooperation between VESID counselors and Board of Education transition linkage personnel should result in better educational, vocational, counseling, and placement services for students with disabilities. The "Training Transitional Linkage Coordinators for Urban Schools" Program, conducted by the Center for Advanced Study in Education (CASE) of the Graduate and University Center of City University of New York (CUNY), in collaboration with the New York City Board of Education's Special Education Unit (High Schools) and VESID, is reported herein in detail because it represents a consortium model for the development and delivery of transition services to students with disabilities.[1]

[1]This project is supported by a grant from the U.S. Department of Education, Office of Special Education and Rehabilitation Services, Division of Personnel Preparation.

Training Transitional Linkage Coordinators for Urban Schools

Overview

The goal for this project is to train high school special educators as Transition Linkage Coordinators (TLCs), in order to respond to the postsecondary training and/or employment needs of high school students in special education. By creating the TLC position, the project attempts to codify and pinpoint responsibility for the developmental and logistical aspects of the transition process. The project focuses on the need to increase the number of trained personnel with competencies to link secondary students and their families with agencies and services once the student leaves high school. This project enables the school to intervene early and effectively while the students are still in school by having a TLC, who not only provides referral services, but also brings postsecondary resources and services into the school early enough to affect students' expectations and performance, thereby providing for an overlap rather than an abutment approach to maintain.

During each of three 12-month project periods, beginning in September 1988, 35 special educators are being trained in a five-credit graduate-level sequence that focuses on the transition process. The project, which trains personnel for a new role in their school as TLC, consists of field-based training seminars and a practicum. During the fall term, the project

continued on next page

trains participants in competencies needed to carry out linkage activities. By the end of the Fall semester, participants have developed a full-scale linkage activity plan that they implement in the Spring practicum. The project is now in the second half of its second year of operation. Recruitment for the third year of operation is already in progress.

Implicit in the program design is the attention devoted to linking postsecondary service provides and the business community with the school in an overlapping manner. Thus, students and their parents, from the onset of their high school experience, become aware of and/or involved with an array of community resources, e.g., VESID, community colleges (regular and special programs), business councils, proprietary trade and technical schools. This linkage between schools and outside resources ensures that there is sufficient time for making postsecondary plans.

Each Fall session's training for TLCs, consisting of 12 sessions, combines formal presentations by representatives of agencies (e.g., VESID, OMH, OMRDD, Job Path), community colleges, New York City Board of Education special projects, and the private sector (e.g., IBM, Port Authority), informal small-group sharing by the course participants about problems, issues, and concerns, as well as instruction and readings regarding state of the art approaches to transition.

During each Spring semester, when instructors visit course participants at their school sites, opportunities are provided to observe "firsthand" how well linkage activities are proceeding and what technical assistance is needed. On-site visits, during the practicum phase, offer a productive way to improve participants' understanding and performance of the TLC's role.

An essential ingredient of this program is the collaborative relationship among CASE's TLC project personnel; Board of Education Special Education Unit administrators and Citywide Administrator of Transition; and VESID representatives as members of an advisory committee. This advisory committee reviewed recruitment procedures, revised selection criteria and materials, delineated functions appropriate to the TLC's role, and discussed problems and concerns related to the new position. In addition, they become advocates in support of an administrative allowance to provide time for TLCs to preform their duties in schools.

Accomplishments

The TLCs Program has impacted on high schools citywide. By the end of three years of project implementation, there will be one individual in each high school of New York City who will have been trained to undertake the duties and functions of a TLC within their respective school site.

Based on observations during the practicum phase of the project, instructors have seen TLCs perform diverse and varied roles. Variations seem most dependent on student needs, time allotted for TLC services, and participants' competencies and skills. There are basic tasks performed during the practicum by all TLCs as they develop competence in the role.

All TLCs performed basic duties such as:

- identifying a group of students for orientation to the world of work, career information, and exploratory "hands-on" career experiences. This group of students - from 5 to 25 - consisted of 9th, 10th, 11th, and 12th graders who were seen individually and/or in groups to provide career education lessons for one or more sessions;
- consulting with the VESID counselor to make a list of students to be given agency appointments and/or in-school services;
- keeping logs and other records on the services given to students identified as the TLC caseloads;
- conferring with the VESID counselors, teachers, school counselors, psychologists, and administrators to obtain assessment information about identified students;
- reviewing IEPs and other school records to obtain background information on identified students;
- meeting with parents of identified students to share information about academic programs and after-school plans for work and postsecondary training;
- preparing applications for postsecondary training institutions, such as two and four year colleges;
- accessing resources within the school for students in the area of Career Education; and

- collaborating with Work Study Programs in the corporate sector and within the Board of Education.

Some TLCs have been able to develop highly organized programs which include special events for the entire special education population in the school (400 students). For example, one TLC organized a Career Day for special education students and their parents, with presentations, exhibits, and resource materials representing 25 businesses, agencies, and community colleges. Another TLC cooperated with the VESID counselor to do joint exit interviews for all 12th-graders, involving parents, students, and teachers in the process.

A recent practicum activity resulted from the collaboration among TLCs in three different high schools. These TLCs organized an all-day workshop for students from three schools, which was held in a centrally-located high school. Didactic and experiential presentations were made relating to self-esteem, collaborative learning, and career values. A working luncheon was part of the program. Students were enthusiastic in their evaluation of the day's workshop. They seemed most positive about a career education exercise called "Self-Esteem Activity" Design Your Own T-Shirt."

Another TLC assists 11th-graders to make an "Individual Transition" folder, which consists of important papers needed to facilitate job getting (e.g., social security card, working papers, names and addresses of references, resume, bus and train maps).

Many TLCs who are work study coordinators or teachers of career-related courses (e.g., Business Communications, Introduction to Careers) have incorporated transition approaches in these regular assignments. Students in these classes have been chosen for enrichment activities, in individual and group work sessions, involving trips to industry, speakers, and mini-sessions on resume writing and interview practice.

There are many other examples of appropriate ways that TLCs have developed their assignments to serve special education high school students as they move from school to employment or to postsecondary training. It seems clear that course participants have made strenuous efforts to t ake what they have learned and adapted, modified, and changed it to meet the needs of their student populations.

Issues and Concerns

TLCs do a creditable job, even when they are given minimal or not time allowance. Most teachers assigned to this important function do get a time allowance (e.g., reduced teaching load, no administrative assignments). Those with regular allowances were able to develop and implement an organized program, which includes a caseload of students representing grades 9 through 12. These TLCs worked with *all* students not just "at risk" ones. Those with a regular time allotment and space to conduct their TLC duties were more likely to have positive and ongoing relationships with support school personnel and VESID.

The Grant which provides training for these coordinators ends in 1991. The vital work of transitioning for special education students is seen as a priority for the New York City Board of Education Division of High Schools, Special Education Operations. It is recognized that, in order for these coordinators to maintain their role and function as TLCs, administrative support will be necessary.

While course instructors witnessed many situations where TLCs were in active collaboration with VESID counselors, there were other instances where workloads precluded assignment of a VESID counselor to a school on a regular basis. It is hoped that VESID, with its expanded mission, will be able to increase linkages with New York City.

Summary

There is an urgent and pressing need to help students make a "seamless" transition from school to employment or to postsecondary training. This need for "transitioning" applies to both able-bodied students and those with disabilities.

It is incumbent upon school personnel, in cooperation with VESID counselors, to assist special education students to achieve to the limit of their potential so that they make informed and satisfying career choices which benefit society as well as the individuals involved.

The "Training Transitional

continued on next page

Linkage Coordinators for Urban Schools" Program is presented as a prototype for providing participants with collaborative skills and strategies in their work with VESID, the corporate world, Department of Labor, Armed Forces, postsecondary institutions, and other resources to facilitate more effective linkages of special education students with the world of work.

David Katz has conducted a number of statewide programs related to vocational and career education for the handicapped. As a curriculum coordinator for the Bureau of Curriculum Development, New York City Board of Education, he was responsible for research and development of curriculum programs in special education.

For 17 years, Dr. Katz worked in inner-city schools as a teacher, guidance counselor, and supervisor. He was active in Parent-Teacher Associations having large bilingual membership and for five years supervised special education programs having a substantial number of Hispanic students.

Statewide postsecondary programs directed by Dr. Katz include College and Industry: Partners in the Handicapped Employment Role and Community College Workshop/ Conference Program: Responding to the Need of the Disabled Student. He was awarded an International Exchange for Experts on Rehabilitation Fellowship from the World Rehabilitation Fund in 1981.

During 1982-83, Dr. Katz was Project Director of a pilot program for the New York City Board of Education that trained bilingual parents of handicapped youth in East Harlem and the upper West Side.

Mildred K. Lee has had extensive and varied academic and professional work experience on all levels of education including 1) Supervisor of Educational/Vocational Guidance, District 8, New York City Board of Education (30,000 pupils, 40 counselors in 27 schools—elementary, intermediate, and junior high); 2) practicum supervisor of M.S. degree Guidance Institute—M.S. Office of Education and National Defense Education Act; 3) instructor of graduate courses in group dynamics, child guidance, cultural and social bases of urban education.

Dr. Lee has worked in inner-city schools for more than 20 years and as a guidance counselor and supervisor worked with special education staffs in developing career education materials, conducting parenting skills program, and developing multicultural education programs.

Among the awards received by Dr. Lee are Hunter College Hall of Fame; The Council for Exceptional Children, Certificate of Achievement; National Alliance of Business, Certificates of Recognition; and National Council of Negro Women award for outstanding achievement in the field of education.

Employers and the Community Mental Health Center: Partners Opening Doors for Youth At-Risk

by R. Jonathan Ball
Dierdre Allen-Burns

When 17-year-old youths walk through the door of a psychiatric clinic, they typically feel defeated in their efforts to move toward adulthood. The possibilities for their future appear to them to have been narrowed or lost altogether. While they may have had, in the past, the same range of dreams and abilities as other teenagers, they now find themselves stuck.

Keeping them on their path from childhood to adulthood may be as much the role of the employer as of the psychotherapist. Indeed, at this crucial late-adolescent juncture, employers join the family and school as the major influences shaping the experiences of young people. Mental health intervenors must be geared to helping these elements of the community and their clients interact productively in order to be successful.

These were the assumptions of the psychotherapists of the Adolescent/Young Adult Service when we launched a VESID-sponsored supported work project. The project has now been in operation for over a year, targeting persistently and severely mentally ill youth who had left school in 1989 or 1990. We have already had some encouraging results due, in large part, to partnerships formed between our treatment